

श्रीपितृव्यचरणेषु

CONTENTS

PREFACE. ix
SYSTEM OF TRANSLITERATION xii
ABBREVIATIONS xiii
INTRODUCTION 1-8

Chapters

I. THE JANAPADAS OF RAJASTHAN AND THE MAGADHAN EMPIRE 9-45
- The Matsya Janapada 12
- Rajasthan and the Magadhan Empire 15
- The Mālavas 24
- The Śibis 27
- The Ārjunāyanas 30
- The Yaudheyas 32
- The Abhiras 34
- The Śūdras 35
- The Rājanyas 36
- The Uddehikas 36
- Date of the Arrival of the Punjab Tribes in Rajasthan 38

II. RAJASTHAN IN THE SCYTHIAN PERIOD 46-80
- The Political Background 46
- Śaka-Mālava Struggle : The First Phase 48
- Śaka-Mālava Struggle : The Second Phase 52
- Śaka-Mālava Struggle : The Third Phase 60
- The Yaudheyas 66
- Rajasthan on the Eve of the Rise of the Guptas : Transition to Monarchism 68

III. RAJASTHAN IN THE AGE OF THE GUPTA EMPIRE 81-131
- Rise of the Guptas 81
- Samudragupta and Rajasthan 83

Continuity of the Gupta Rule in Rajasthan 90
The Aulikaras (Varmans) of Daśapura-Madhyamikā Region 93
The Yaudheya Region 97
The Vākāṭaka Invasion of Rajasthan in the Middle of the Fifth Century 99
The Hūṇa Invasion : First and Second Phases 106
Rajasthan and the Aulikara (Vardhana) Empire 112
The Hūṇa Invasion : Third Phase 118
IV. RAJASTHAN IN THE MAUKHARI-VARDHANA AGE 132-174
The Later Guptas of Rajasthan 132
The Age of the Maukhari Domination 139
The Age of the Gauḍa Supremacy 146
The Pratīhāras of Māṇḍavyapura 148
The Gurjaras or Chāpas of Bhillamāla 157
Other Powers of Post-Gupta Rajasthan :
The Chāhamānas 162
The Guhilas 163
Rajasthan and Harshavardhana of Kanauj 168
V. RAJASTHAN IN THE POST-HARSHA CENTURY 175-201
The Guhilas of Medapāṭa 175
The Guhilas of Chāṭsu 183
The Mauryas of Mewar 185
The Pratīhāras of Māṇḍvyapura 186
The Arab Invasion of Rajasthan 190
Invasions of Yaśovarman of Kanauj and Lalitāditya Muktāpīḍa of Kashmir 192
The Rise of the Imperial Pratīhāras 197
APPENDIX
Origin and Evolution of Vikramāditya Legend 202
BIBLIOGRAPHY 217
INDEX 249

PREFACE

It may be regarded as an audacious presumption on my part to attempt on a subject the study of the various aspects of which has been undertaken by such illustrious scholars as James Tod, G.H. Ojha, D.R. Bhandarkar, B.N. Reu, C.V. Vaidya, H.C. Ray, D.C. Ganguli, G.C. Raychaudhuri, A.C. Banerji, D.C. Sircar, R.C. Majumdar, A.K. Majumdar, Dasharatha Sharma and G.N. Sharma. But these great scholars have mostly given the history of pre-Imperial Pratīhāra period of Rajasthan only a cursory treatment, usually as a sort of background to their esteemed monographs on the various Rajput dynasties and states. Partly because of the glory associated with the name of the Rajputs and partly because of the wealth of materials available for their history, it was but natural for these savants to concentrate on the early medieval periods of the history of Rajasthan. However, I feel that the researches of the last few decades have resulted in a great advance of our knowledge of the pre-Pratīhāra Rajasthan also and, therefore, a detailed study of the early history of this region may now be attempted. If the present work fills up this lacuna in the historiography of Rajasthan I shall consider my labour amply rewarded.

I became interested in the history and culture of this glorious land ever since I joined the University Department of History as a lecturer in 1964. This interest, however, remained sterile till my supervisor Dr. S.R. Goyal joined the Department as a Reader in 1970. No amount of conventional expression of gratitude can do justice to my deep sense of indebtedness to him. Right from the beginning of my research work he has been the

main source of inspiration to me. He has given me friendly guidance and brotherly encouragement and has willingly rendered all sort of help. I just cannot thank him adequately. His help would remain a [illegible] which I can never repay.

I express my profound gratitude to Professor G.R. Sharma, Head of the Department of Ancient History, Culture and Archaeology, University of Allahabad, Dr. G.C. Pande, former Vice-Chancellor of the University of Rajasthan, Jaipur, and presently Professor in the Department of Ancient History, Culture and Archaeology, University of Allahabad, Professor B.N.S. Yadav of the same University, Professor Lallanji Gopal of the Department of Ancient History, Culture and Archaeology, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi and Dr. S.N. Chaturvedi, Reader, Department of Ancient History, Archaeology and Culture, University of Gorakhpur for their kind encouragement and valuable suggestions given to me from time to time.

I am grateful to Professor K.S. Lal, Head of the Department of History, University of Jodhpur, who helped me several ways during the course of my research work.

I am highly obliged to Dr. S.D. Kapoor (Lecturer, Department of English, University of Jodhpur), Dr. A.D. Singh (Lecturer, Department of Sanskrit, University of Jodhpur), and Dr. M.H. Qureshi (Associate Professor, J.L. Nehru University, Delhi) for their help and constructive suggestions.

I am also grateful to all of my colleagues and friends, particularly Dr. S.K. Lal (Reader, Department of Sociology University of Jodhpur), Dr. S.P. Dikshit (Reader Department of Hindi Lucknow University), Dr. P.D. Pathak (Senior Research Officer, Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute, Jodhpur), Śrī M.C. Joshi and Dr. S.K. Purohit (Lecturers, Department of History University of Jodhpur). I express my sincere thanks to all of them for helping me in so many ways.

I will not disburden myself by thanking Dr. H.P. Srivastava (Lecturer, Department of Botany, University of Jodhpur) for his constant encouragement.

It is my duty to place on record my thanks to the authorities of the Allahabad University Library, Allahabad, National Museum Library, Delhi, Jodhpur University Library, Jodhpur,

Sumer Public Library, Jodhpur and Oriental Research Institute Library, Jodhpur, for facilities provided to me.

Who would be happier than my revered *pitṛivya* Sāhitya Vāridhi Kāvyālaṅkārāchārya Professor R.S. Shukla 'Rasal' D. Litt. when he will find that his long cherished desire has been fulfilled and even I, the prodigal son of the family, have ultimately offered my respects at the feet of Sarasvatī ? Finally a word of appreciation to my wife Smt. Suman Shukla, M.A. for her assistance and cooperation in multiple ways that made it possible for me to complete the present work.

This book is substantially the thesis submitted for the Degree of Ph.D. the University of Jodhpur in 1975. It owes considerably for its publication to the University Grants Commission's subsidy (for publication of doctoral thesis) of Rs. 3,000/-generously sanctioned by the University of Jodhpur for which I express my gratitude to the University.

Its timely publication has been mainly due to the willing cooperation extended to me by my friend Sri Kishore Chandra Jain of the Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan, Delhi. I take this opportunity to extend my thanks to him.

D.C. SHUKLA

Jodhpur
Vasant Pañchamī
Māgha, 2034 V.S.
(February 12, 1978)

SYSTEM OF TRANSLITERATION

अ	a
आ	ā
इ	i
ई	ī
उ	u
ऊ	ū
ए	e
ऐ	ai
ओ	o
औ	au
ऋ	ṛi
क्	k
ख्	kh
ग्	g
घ्	gh
ङ्	ṅ
च्	ch
छ्	chh
ज्	j
झ्	jh
ञ्	ñ
ट्	ṭ
ठ्	ṭh
ड्	ḍ
ढ्	ḍh
ण्	ṇ
त्	t
थ्	th
द्	d
ध्	dh
न्	n
प्	p
फ्	ph
ब्	b
भ्	bh
म्	m
य्	y
र्	r
ल्	l
व्	v
श्	ś
ष्	sh
स्	s
ह्	h
Anusvāra	ṁ
Visarga (:)	ḥ

ABBREVIATIONS

ABORI	Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.
AHD	*Ancient History of the Deccan.* By G. Jouveau Dubreuil, Pondichery, 1920.
AIG	The Age of the Imperial Guptas. By R.D. Banerji, Banaras, 1933.
AIU	The History and Culture of the Indian People, Vol. II., The Age of Imperial Unity. Edited by R.C. Majumdar and Pusalker, Bombay, 1960.
AIK	The History and Culture of the Indian People, Vol. IV., The Age of Imperial Kanauj. Edited by R.C. Majumdar, A.D. Pusalker and A.K. Majumdar, Bombay, 1964.
ĀMMK	Ārya *Mañjuśrī Mūla*-Kalpa.
ANM	Age of the Nandas and Mauryas. Edited by K.A.N. Sastri, Banaras, 1952.
Ancient Malwa	Ancient Malwa and the Vikramāditya Tradition, by D.C. Sircar, Delhi, 1969.
ASIR	Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Reports.
Bhandarkar List	A List of Inscriptions of Northern India, by D.R. Bhandarkar (Appendix to EI, XIX-XXIII).
Bhārata Kaumudī	Studies in Indology in Honour of R.K. Mookerji, 2 Parts. *Allahabad*, 1945, 1947.

BMC-AWK	Catalogue of the Coins of the A Dynasty, the Western Kshatrapas, Traikuṭaka dynasty and the Bod dynasty (Catalogue of the Indian C in the British Museum, Vol. IV London, 1908. By E.J. Rapson.
BMC-GD	Catalogue of the Coins of the C Dynasties and of Śaśāṅka, King Gauḍa (In the British Museum) by Jo Allan, London, 1914.
CA	The History and Culture of the Indi People, Vol. III., The Classical A Edited by R.C. Majumdar, A.D. P ker and A.K. Majumdar. Bombay, 196
CII	Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, Vol III (Inscriptions of the Early Gupt Kings and their Successors), by J.F Fleet, Varanasi, 1963.
Coinage	The Coinage of the Gupta Empire. B A.S. Altekar, Banaras, 1957.
Comp. Hist. Ind.	Comprehensive History of India, Vo II. Edited by K.A.N. Sastri, Bombay 1957.
DKA	Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Age. By F.E. Pargiter, Varanasi, 1962.
DKM	The Decline of the Kingdom of M By B.P. Sinha, Patna, 1954.
EHI	The Early History of India. By Vinc A. Smith, 4th Ed. Oxford, 1962.
EHNI	Early History of North India. By S Chattopadhyaya. Calcutta, 1958.
EI	Epigraphia Indica.
HIG	A History of the Imperial Guptas. B S.R. Goyal. Allahabad, 1966.
Hist. Ind.	History of India, A.D. 150-350. By K.P. Jayaswal, Lahore, 1933.
HNEI	History of North-Eastern India. By R.G Basak, Calcutta, 1934.

INTRODUCTION

Rajasthan is a paradise for historians and archaeologists. It is extraordinarily rich in historical and archaeological materials. That is why it was the first region of our country the history of which was treated in detail by modern historians. The great work of Col. James Tod, *The Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan*, (ed. Crooke) was published in 1920. It would appear that it is now almost out of date. But it is still indispensible for further research. Only it needs to be re-edited critically. Kavirāja Shyāmal Dās wrote his *Vīra-vinoda* in V.S. 1943 (1886 A.D.) after a careful scrutiny of material which was made available to him by Mahārāṇā Fateh Singhji of Udaipur. It is a monumental work and a mine of information not only for the history of Mewar but also for the history of such other states as were connected with it. However, the work which may be regarded as the second landmark in the Rajasthan historiography was written by Mahāmahopādhyāya Dr. Gauri Shanker Hirachandra Ojha. His *History of Rajputana* (Rājputāne kā Itihāsa) written state-wise in several volumes was published between 1927 and 1940. It had the additional charm of being written in the national language. It contains the history of almost all the important princely states of Rajputana except Kota, Bundi and Jaipur. His deep knowledge of Sanskrit, Apabhraṁśa and Rajasthani as well as epigraphy, numismatics and archaeology lent his work accuracy and precision. After him a number of scholars such as L.P. Tessitori, B.N. Reu, R.K. Asopa, Lala Sita Ram, J.S. Gehlot, A. Banerji, A.C. Banerji, M.L. Sharma, Dasharatha Sharma, G.N. Sharma and many others[1] paid their

1. A large number of scholars, such as C.V. Vaidya, H C. Ray, G.C. Raychaudhuri, D. R. Bhandarkar, etc, have also dealt with the history of various dynasties belonging to Rajasthan in their respective works on early medieval, medieval and modern periods of Indian history.

attention to the history of the various princely states of Rajasthan, but no scholar of note has cast his net sufficiently wide as to write a critical, comprehensive and balanced history of the whole of Rajasthan. Recently Dr. Dasharatha Sharma has done the most significant work in this respect by editing the *Rajasthan Through the Ages*, Vol. I, published in 1966. Dr. G.N. Sharma's book *Rājasthāna kā Itihāsa*, pt. I (published in 1973) is another attempt in this direction, though it has its own limitations.

The treatises of the great savants noted above, but for the work edited by Dr. D. Sharma, are written in simple style of factual narration. Further, they suffer from another limitation ; in them the history of the (pre-Imperial) Pratīhāra period of Rajasthan has not been discussed satisfactorily. Of course all the above mentioned scholars have discussed the early history of the region they have selected for their work. But this early history has been written only as a background for the history of the main period of this region. Even the work of Dasharatha Sharma, which is supposed to be a comprehensive history of Rajasthan from the earliest times to 1316 A.D. and is written in about a thousand pages, devotes only 24 pages (pp. 48-72) to 'Historic Rajasthan from 500 B.C. to 700 A.D.'

Obviously the modern historians of Rajasthan have found it easy to work on the epigraphic and literary source-materials which are found in abundance from the age of the Imperial Pratīhāras onwards. But now we have ample materials to reconstruct the history of early Rajasthan also. In the present work an humble attempt has been made in this direction.

In the present thesis the history of Rajasthan has been viewed as the history of a region of India, as a part of the whole. As Dr. G.C. Pande has pointed out, some dangerous tendencies are noticeable in the field of regional history writing in modern India. "Almost in every state of India", Dr. Pande observes, "attempts are being made as to write regional histories and in some cases even to evolve distinctly regional versions of the history of India which do less justice

to her national evolution... Regional history has an undoubtedly important place, but that place is *within* the larger canvas of national history. Regions or *mahājanapadas* to use an ancient term, are quasi-natural, quasi-historical articulations of the continental, cultural history of India or *Jambudvīpa*... The real utility of regional history lies not in its appeal to local sentiments and aspirations... but in its being a very fruitful area of detailed research."[1] In actual practice this approach means that the history of Rajasthan should be viewed as the history of a significant division of the larger geographical unit, i.e. India. In other words, it is against the background of the national history of India that the events of the local history of Rajasthan should be evaluated. In our work we have tried to adhere to this approach and have discussed the history of early Rajasthan within the larger canvas of our national history.

The present state of Rajasthan, the abode of the princes (a Sanskrit form of the Diṅgala word *Rājathāna*) was constituted hardly a quarter of a century ago by the amalgamation of nineteen princely states on Nov. 1, 1956 under the State Reorganisation Act, 1956. The appelation of 'Rajasthan' is, however, older. It is popularly believed that this nomenclature was coined by Col. Tod but its use even before him is proved by the *Arzī Bahīs* of Jodhpur, now deposited in the State Archives, Bikaner. The first mention of Rajasthan as a compact land occurs in an inscription of V.S. 1765 (1708 A.D.).[2]

Geographically the present state of Rajasthan is bounded on the west and north-west by Pakistan, on the north and north-east by the Panjab and Uttar Pradesh and on the south by Madhya Pradesh and Gujarat. Its shape is rhombic and its present area is 342,214. sq. km. It is divisible into two parts. The dividing barrier provided by nature is the Aravallis which, running north-east to south-west, for about 692 kilo-

1. *Rajasthan History Congress*, VII Session, Pali, 1974, Presidential Address, pp. 2-3.
2. Sharma, G.N., *Social Life in Medieval Rajasthan*, p. 1, fn. 1.

meters, forms the backbone of the state and divides it int two regions with clearly distinct features. On the west and the north lies the arid plain and the ever shifting, sandy hills of *marudeśa.* Rainless storms tirelessly lash the hot parched sandy deserts generating heat and creating mirages. The rivers o this area dried up long ago making the Thar, indeed, a for midable barrier to be overcome before the advent of the age of machine. However, on the east and the south-east o the Aravalli hills are the forests and plains of black loan furrowed by the running streams of Mewar, Haroti anc Jaipur regions. This area is comparatively more fertile anc humid.

Here it is necessary to point out that this geographica outline of modern Rajasthan was not always in consonanc with political realities. For example politically Mathura Gwalior, Ujjain, Mandasor and many other adjoining region are not included in the present state of Rajasthan. But fro the point of view of ancient history of this area these region cannot be totally neglected. It is specifically true in the cas of West Malwa which was politically and culturally indisting uishable from southern Rajasthan in ancient times. We would therefore, include West Malwa within our purview whil dealing with the early history of Rajasthan.

The study of pre-historic and proto-historic Rajasthan i still in its infancy. In the absence of the fossil remains c Early Man in any part of India, historians and archaeologis have been able to identify him only on the basis of the crud stone tools left by him. They belong to the pre-historic ag which is assignable to the period C. 2,00,000 to 3000 B.C Broadly speaking we have two fundamentally varying ston tool cultures that flourished in the early stone age India. On is the southern bifacial core tool culture, also termed as th Madrasian. The other tool culture called Soan comes withi the flake or chopper family. It is mainly confined to the valle of the Soan and the Indus. A number of stone age sites hav been discovered in the various parts of the country mostly i the river valleys. However, in most of the cases the stone ag tools are removed from their original context and are availabl

as surface finds. The credit of collecting the first Old Stone Age tools from Rajasthan goes to C.A. Hackett, an officer of the Geological Survey of India. These were from Jaipur, Bundi and Indargarh. Since 1953-54, however, further investigations have been taken up in right earnest. For this phase of the study of Old Stone Age in Rajasthan we are primarily indebted to Sri V.N. Misra who carried out explorations in the districts of Ajmer, Barmer, Jodhpur, Marwar, Chitorgarh, Bhilwara and Tonk in the valleys of Luni, Guhiya, Razia, Berach, etc.[1] It is now established that south-east Rajasthan was inhabited by men from the early stone age when small communities of food gatherers and hunters equipped with Acheullian handaxes wandered along the banks of Berach and its tributaries. According to Satya Prakash, South Rajasthan was a pivotal region where both the Soan industry of Panjab and the culture of Madras met.[2]

When and how the Old Stone Age culture ended is not definitely known. Though no neoliths have been found anywhere in Rajasthan, we have information about the discovery of microliths from several areas of the State, notably Ahar, Chitorgarh in Udaipur region and Bhilwara, Ajmer, Jaipur, Pali and Tonk districts.

For the Proto-historic period, the famous sites of Kalibangan in the north-west and Ahad (or Ahar) in the south have yeilded very significant material. Its interpretation has engaged the attention of archaeologists for many years. A. Ghosh, B.B. Lal and H.D. Sankalia have done pioneer work in this field. In recent years Sankalia has tried to give an overall interpretation of this evidence. He has sought to emancipate himself from the racial and regional pride of these days by tentatively supporting the hypothesis of a colonization at each stage of the proto-historic development of Rajasthan.[3]

1. *Indian Archaeology—A Review*, 1953-54, 1954-55, 1956-57, 1957-58 and 1958-59.
2. *The Researcher*, Vol. II, p. 27 ; cf. Vol. V-VI, p. 52.
3. Cf. G.C. Pande, *Rajasthan History Congress*, VII Session, Pali, 1974, Presidential Address.

Whatever the origin of the pre-historic civilization of Rajasthan its links with Indus civilization cannot be denied. The cult of Śiva and the institution of *Yoga*, for example, appear to have been characteristic of the religious life of the people of this area just like those of the Sindh and the South Panjab.

Further exploration work has been undertaken by the Department of Archaeology of the state under the supervision of its Directors, S.P. Srivastava and R.C. Agarwal, and their colleagues.

From the point of view of Indian history Rajasthan is a *cul-de-sac* i.e. an area of refuse and isolation. Whenever the people and tribes of the Panjab, Uttar Pradesh, Malwa, Gujarat and Sindh were pressed hard they took shelter in the desert and the hilly and forest regions of Rajasthan. It was so from as early times as the Vedic Age. When the Aryans entered India, they were divided into a large number of *janas* each of which was headed by a *janapati* or king. They were engaged in incessant warfare not only with the non-Aryans but also among themselves. The most important example of such conflicts is the Dāśarājña in which Sudas, the Bharata king, defeated a confederacy of ten kings on the bank of Parushṇī. He also defeated a few more tribes.[1] Some of the tribes vanquished by him went to other regions. This accelerated the process of migration, and some of them entered Rajasthan also.

Among the Vedic *janas* who entered Rajasthan in the Vedic age were the Satvants (Satvatas of the later epochs), the Śālvas and the Matsyas. The Satvatas are also known as Bhojas and Yādavas. According to the Purāṇas, they descended from Yadus, one of the ten *janas* defeated by Sudās in the Dāśarājña. When did they enter Rajasthan is not known, but a passage of the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* seems to suggest that in the later Vedic period the Satvatas were ruling in the southern region. Here the term "southern region" is not clear, but it is possible that it included the region to the south of Mathura

1. *The Vedic Age*, pp. 254 ff.

from where the Bhojas spread in different parts of Rajasthan, Gujarat and Madhya Pradesh.

The Śālvas had their earlier settlement near the Yamuna since the early Vedic period. Perhaps the earliest mention of this tribe is found in the *Gopatha Brāhmaṇa* where they appear in connection with the Matsyas.[1] They are also noted in the *Mahābhārata* along with the Mādreyas and the Jangalas. According to the *Mahābhārata*, the Śālva country was situated near Kurukshetra and was the kingdom of the father of Satyavān, the husband of Sāvitrī. Their capital seems to have been Śālvapura.[2] Pāṇini mentions Śālva, Śālvavayava and Śālveya[3] as three distinct *janapada* units which had monarchical government.[4] The association of the Śālveyakas with Rajasthan becomes evident from the *Mahābhārata* where they are grouped with the Matsyas whose territory is located in the present Jaipur—Bharatpur—Alwar region, with Virāṭanagara, modern Bairat, as its capital.[5] Cunningham has suggested that the name Śālvapura may be traced in Alwar.[6] According to Dasharatha Sharma, the Uttamabhadras "who fought against (sic.) the Śaka general Ushavadāta were another splinter state of this family, the original capital of which might have been Bhadrā in the north-eastern part of the erst-while Bikaner State.[7]

The Matsyas were intimately connected with the Śālvas for both of them are mentioned as a pair *janapada* in the *Gopatha Brāhamaṇa* (1.2.9). The Matsyas were one of the enemies of Sudās, and it is quite possible that because of their defeat at his hand they migrated to Bairat region in Rajasthan. But all the Matsyas did not abandon their home-

1. *Gopatha Brāhmaṇa*, 1.2.9.
2. Cf. Law, B.C., *Tribes in Ancient India*, pp. 66-67.
3. *Ashṭādhyāyī*, IV. 2.135 ; IV 1.173 ; IV. 1.169.
4. Cf. Przyluski, J., *Indian Studies : Past and Present*, Vol. II, No. 1, 1960, pp. 37-61.
5. Cf. *infra*, Ch. I.
6. *Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Report*, XX, p. 120.
7. *Rajasthan Through the Ages*, Vol. 1, p. 50.

land in the Kurukshetra region. In the *Mahābhārata* the Matsyas of Kurukshetra are said to have lent their support to Kurus while those of Bairat helped the Pāṇḍavas in the Great War.[1] The first Chapter of the present work attempts to give a detailed account of the Śālvas and Matsyas.

From the above analysis it is obvious that by the close of the Vedic Age Rajasthan had become fully colonized by the Vedic tribes. In the centuries preceding the beginning of the *Janapada* period they must have imbibed the cultural traditions of the proto-historic civilization, at least to some extent. However, they were far away from Madhyadeśa and later on eastern India to which the centre of cultural life and political power had shifted in the later Vedic period. Therefore, Rajasthan lay in comparative isolation when the historical period of India began with the advent of the Buddha and the establishment of the Magadhan empire.

1. *Mahābhārata*, V. 161-21, V. 160-103.

CHAPTER I

THE JANAPADAS OF RAJASTHAN AND THE MAGADHAN EMPIRE

The historical period of India commences with the age of Mahāvīra and Buddha. The date of the latter has been fixed with tolerable degree of certainty from 563 B.C. to 483 B.C.[1] and the former is supposed to have died a few years after the latter.[2] While dealing with the lives of Mahāvīra and Buddha and the history of their respective faiths, the early Buddhist and Jain literature provide us very useful material for the reconstruction of Indian history from the rise of Bimbisāra to the accession of Aśoka. There is in addition the evidence available in the Brahmanical sources. In the age of the Buddha we find India passing through the last phase of the Vedic political tradition.[3] The Aryan states which in the Rigvedic period were tribal in character (*janas*) became territorial in nature (*janapadas*) in the Later Vedic Age owing to the operation of several factors such as the second Urban revolution,[4] introduction of iron,[5] growth of trade and com-

1. The date of Buddha's *parinirvāṇa* is a controversial question. Some scholars believe that it took place in 544 B.C , while others assign it to 486 or 483 B.C. For a brief review of the different theories cf. Geiger, W. *Mahāvaṁśa*, p. xii ; Raychaudhuri, H. C., *Political History of Ancient India*, pp. 186 ff. ; Winternitz, M., *History of Indian Literature*, Vol. II. p. 597 ; Smith, V A., *Early History of India*, pp. 49-50 ; Majumdar and Pusalker (ed.), *The Age of Imperial Unity*, pp. 36 ff.
2. *AIU*, p. 37.
3. Cf. Rao, V.B., *Uttara Vaidika Samāja evam Saṁskriti*, pp. 162 ff.
4. Cf. Bandyopadhyaya, N.C., *Economic Life and Progress in Ancient India*, Vol. I, pp. 240 ff, 285 ff.
5. Cf. Banerjee, N.R., *The Iron Age in India.*

merce[1] and money economy[2] and the emergence of the art of writing.[3] Gradually the Vedic tribes settled down permanently in the various parts of the country according to their convenience and opportunities. One of the results of the territorialisation of the Vedic states was an increase in their internal struggles. With the emergence of the idea of definite territorial boundaries, it was natural for the rulers of the various states to conquer additional lands for the satisfaction of their people, the fulfilment of their economic necessities, and for their own glorification. This tendency started the process of the expansion of the more powerful *janapadas* at the cost of the weaker ones.

In the beginning of the sixth century B.C. we find North India divided into a large number of states (*janapadas*), some of which were autonomous clans with a republican or oligarchical form of government, while others were monarchies.[4] The Buddhist[5] and the Jain[6] texts provide a list of sixteen great states (Ṣoḍaśa Mahājanapada) which were flourishing before the age of the Buddha. They are pretty well-known, and we need not enumerate them here. The *Ashṭādhyāyī* of Pāṇini[7]

1. Cf. Motichandra, *Sārthavāha*; Majumdar, R.C., *Corporate Life in Ancient India*; Malalasekera, G.P., *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*, Vol. II; *AIU*, pp. 599 ff.
2. Cf. Bhandarkar, D.R., *Carmichael Lectures on Ancient Indian Numismatics*, Lecture II; *AIU*, pp. 607-608.
3. Cf. Bühler, *Indian Palaeography*, pp. 1 ff.
4. Cf. Rhys Davids, T.W., *Buddhist India*, Ch. II; Bhandarkar, D.R., *Carmichael Lectures*, 1918, (Lectures I and II).
5. *Aṅguttara*, I, 213; IV, 252, 256, 260; *Mahāvastu*, I, 34; II, 3; *Dīgha*, II, 235.
6. *Bhagavatī Sūtra*, Saya XV, Uddessa I (Hoernle, Uvāsagadasāo, II, App.). The list here is slightly different and includes other states of the far east and far south of India. This list according to H.C. Raychaudhuri is later than the one given in the Buddhist Aṅguttara (*Political History of Ancient India*, VI ed, Calcutta, 1953, p. 96).
7. For a detailed analysis, Vide, Agrawal, V.S., *India as Known to Pāṇini.*

(c. 500 B.C.)[1] depicts a similar picture by mentioning both the classes of states, viz. republics (*saṅghas* or *gaṇas*) and kingdoms (*janapadas*). The *Purāṇas* also mention states like those of the Haihayas, the Vitihotras and others which flourished before the rise of the Nandas.[2] Many of these states, specially the famous four monarchies—Vatsa, Avanti, Kosala and Magadha—made a bid for supremacy. Of them Magadha ultimately succeeded and became a paramount power by the time the Nandas appeared in the political arena towards the end of the fifth or the beginning of the fourth century B.C.[3]

While the *Madhyadeśa* and eastern India were undergoing the process of political unification, the North-Western frontier regions of the country were subjected to foreign invasions. The mighty Achaeminid empire of Iran, founded by Cyrus (558-530 B.C.) was first to threaten and absorb a good portion of these undefended and insecure territories.[4] Nearly two centuries afterwards India fell a victim to the invasion of Alexander, when in the year 327 B.C. the Macedonian adventurer crossed the Hindukush after the completion of his Iranian conquests.[5] But the tide of the Greek onslaught was soon checked when Chandragupta Maurya, after expelling the foreigners from the Panjab and overthrowing the Nandas in Magadha, founded an all-India empire.[6] It is against this background that we have to study the history of Rajasthan in the age of Magadhan imperialism.

1. Agrawal, V. S. *Ibid.* Some scholars such as Goldstrücker place this work in the pre-Buddha period while many others assign a somewhat later date to it (*ibid*).
2. Pargiter, F.E., *Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age*, pp. 23-24, 69.
3. For a detailed account, vide, Raychaudhuri, H.C., *PHAI*, pp. 95 ff, 187 ff ; *AIU*, pp. 3 ff ; Sastri, K.A.N., (ed.), *Age of the Nandas and Mauryas*, pp. 9. ff.
4. *AIU*, pp. 39 ff. For a detailed analysis cf. Chattopadhyaya, S., *The Achaeminids in India*; Rapson, E.J., (ed.), *The Cambridge History of India*, Vol. I (Ancient India), Ch. XIV.
5. Cf. Smith, *EHI*, Ch. III-IV ; *ANM.*, Ch. II.
6. Cf. *PHAI*, pp. 264 ff ; *ANM*, Ch. IV ; *AIU*, pp. 54 ff.

In the list of *Ṣoḍaśa Mahājanapadas* provided by the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* there is only one state which may be located in Rajasthan. That is the famous Matsya or Machchha *janapada* which roughly corresponded to the modern Jaipur division including the whole of the present territory of Alwar as well as a portion of Bharatpur. Other *janapadas* of Rajasthan which might have existed in that period are not mentioned anywhere in our sources. However, some janapadas which primarily belonged to the regions that are now outside the boundaries of the present Rajasthan might have included some portions of this state as well. At least they were intimately connected with the history of this region. Most important of such states were Śūrasena and Avanti belonging to the present Mathura and Ujjain regions respectively. The role of the Śūrasenas which they might have played in the history of Rajasthan of this period is not known, but some glimpses of the impact of the imperialism of the Avantis on this area are available from our literary sources. We shall discuss them at the proper place.

The Matsya Janapada

As we have already seen,[1] the Matsyas were one of the most prominent Kshatriya tribes that made up the Vedic Aryan people. In the *Mahābhārata* the Matsya *janapada* is said to have been rich in the wealth of cows for which the Trigarttas and the Kurus led predatory raids against it.[2] They were highly respected for the purity of their culture.[3] As in the early period, in the Great Epic they figure alongwith several other Vedic Kshatriya tribes such as the Chedis, the Karushas, the Pañchālas, etc.[4] According to the *Manusaṁhitā* also "the plains of the Kurus, the (country of the) Matsyas, Pañchālas and Śūrasenakas, these (form) indeed, the country of the Brahmarshis (Brāhmaṇa sages) which ranks immediately after Brahmāvarta. From a Brāhmaṇa born in that country let all men on

1. *Supra*, Introduction.
2. Cf. Law, B.C., *Tribes in Ancient India*, p. 357.
3. *Ibid*, p. 359.
4. *Mahābhārata*, Bhīshmaparvan, Ch. 9; Ch. 52, 9; Ch. 54, 8.

earth learn their several usages".[1] From this passage it appears that the Matsyas were regarded as belonging to the most orthodox followers of Brahmanism in ancient times. Elsewhere Manu prescribes (when laying down rules for marshalling of troops on the battle-field), "(Men born in) Kurushetra, Matsyas, Pañchālas, and those born in Śūrasena, let him (i.e. the king or leader) cause to fight in the van of the battle as well as (others who are) tall and light".[2] It is because of their purity of conduct and customs and bravery in the battle-field that the Matsyas occupied a pre-eminent position in the contemporary socio-political system.

According to Cunningham, "in ancient times the whole of the country lying between the Aravalli hills of Alwar and the river Jumna was divided between Matsya on the W. and Śūrasena on the E., with Daśārṇa on the S. and S.E. border. Matsya then included the whole of the present Alwar territory, with portions of Jaipur and Bharatpur. Vairat and Machari were both in Matsyadeśa...To the E. were the Pañchālas..."[3] The capital of this state was Virāṭanagara (modern Vairat or Bairat), occasionally called Matsyanagara. It was the seat of the Epic king Virāṭa who was a friend and relative of the Pāṇḍavas.[4] The earliest historical mention of Vairāṭa is that of Yuan-Chwang, the Chinese pilgrim who visited India in the first half of the seventh century A.D. According to him,[5] Po-li-ye-ta-lo (Virat or Bairat) was 14 or 15 Li, or 2½ miles in circuit corresponding almost exactly with the size of the ancient mound on which the present town is built. The people of this city were brave and bold and their king, who was of the Fei-she (Vaiśya)[6] race, was famous for his courage and

1. *Manusamhitā*, II, 19-20 ; S.B.E., Vol. XXV, pp. 32-33.
2. *Ibid*, VII, 193 ; *SBE*, Vol. XXV, p. 247.
3. *Archaeological Survey of India*, Vol. 20, p. 2 ; Cunningham, A., *Ancient Geography of India*, pp. 343-45.
4. Law, B.C., *op. cit.*, p. 361.
5. Watters, T., *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*, Vol. I, p. 300.
6. Cunningham (*Ancient Geography*, p. 343) unnecessarily conjectures that the terms Fei-she corresponds to Bais Rajput.

skill in war.[1] Another important city of the Matsya kingdom was Upaplavya where according to the *Mahābhārata*, the Pāṇḍavas retired from Virāṭa on the completion of their exile.[2] Its exact site is, however, as yet uncertain.

In the Pāli literature the Matsyas are intimately associated with the Śūrasenas and the Kāśis.[3] But it seems that at that time they did not have much political importance surrounded as they were by the powerful kingdoms of Avanti, Śūrasena and Gandhāra. To us it appears quite likely that in the age of the Buddha Rajasthan became a bone of contention between Gandhāra and Avanti and consequently the Matsyas had to submit to (one or the other) as the situation demanded. According to a tradition, the king Pukkusāti (Pushkarasārin) of Gandhāra waged war on Pradyota of Avanti in which the latter was defeated.[4] If there is any truth in this tradition, it will have to be admitted that Pradyota, the ruler of Avanti, had already expanded his kingdom towards the north which included greater part of Rajasthan sometime before his war against Pukkusāti. For it is inconceivable that the king of Gandhāra, who must have been feeling the pressure of Iranians at that time and was soon to submit to the overlordship of the Achaemenian emperors,[5] could dare to advance as far as western Malwa. Evidently, therefore, one must presume that like the rulers of eastern India, who were trying to expand their empires at the cost of their neighbouring states, the powerful monarch of Avanti also tried to satisfy his ambition at the expense of Matsya and other territories of Rajasthan.

Not much is known about the history of Rajasthan in the post-Buddha age. This was the time when the country had to face the Iranian invasion on the North-West, which started with the eastern campaigns of Cyrus (558-530 B.C.). The

1. Watters, T. *Loc. cit.*
2. *Mahābhārata*, IV, 72, 14.
3. *Dīgha Nikāya*, Vol. II, p. 200.
4. Malalasekera, G.P., *op. cit.*, p. 215; Felix Lacote, *Essay on Guṇāḍhya* (Eng. Tra. by Rev. A.M. Tabard) p. 176.
5. Cf., *AIU*, pp. 41-42.

Persian hold on the Indian border-lands continued up to 330 B.C. when we find Darius III, the last of the Achaemenian emperors, using the services of an Indian contingent in his war against Alexander.[1] But there is absolutely no evidence whatsoever to suggest that the Iranians ever tried to invade Rajasthan. In the east it was the age of the rise of Magadha, but so far the Magadhan kings were only one of the four rival powers to make a bid for supremacy; they were yet to conquer Kosala and Vatsa. Therefore, Rajasthan, being situated on the western frontier of the Madhyadeśa, was left for a considerable period without any substantial pressure form the eastern direction. According to Raychaudhuri, as the Matsya kingdom is not included by the Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra* among those states which had a *Saṅgha* or non-monarchical form of governments,[2] the possibility is that its monarchical constitution endured till it lost its independence.[3] Raychaudhuri also conjectures that the Matsya kingdom was at one time annexed to the neighbouring state of Chedi, for the *Mahābhārata* refers to a king named Sahaja who ruled over the Chedis as well as the Matsyas.[4] The suggestion may have some element of truth, though it cannot be proved in the present state of our knowledge.

Rajasthan and the Magadhan Empire

It is not definitely known when the Matsya kingdom was finally absorbed in the Magadhan empire. This much, however, is certain that the Haryaṅkas and Śaiśunāgas had nothing to do with this part of the country while it was undoubtedly included in the empire of the great Mauryas. As regards the Nandas, who ruled in between the Śaiśunāgas and the Mauryas, no definite information is forthcoming. From the Purāṇic and the Classical evidence it is evident that the Nandas carved out a vast empire which comprised the greater part of

1. *AIU*, pp. 39-43.
2. Raychaudhuri, H.C., *PHAI*, p. 137.
3. *Loc. cit.*
4. *Loc. cit.*

North India and some portions of the Deccan.[1] The Purāṇas speak of the extermination by Mahāpadma Nanda of all the Kshatriya families which ruled contemporaneously with the Śaiśunāgas, viz., the Ikshvākus, Pañchālas, Kāśeyas, Haihayas, Kaliṅgas, Aśmakas, Kurus, Maithilas, Śūrasenas and the Vītihotras.[2] The Classical writers state that Agrammes, the king of the Gangaridae and the Prasii, who was the Nanda contemporary of Alexander, ruled up to Beas[3] in the west and the evidence of the Hathīgumphā Cave Inscription of Khāravela[4] proves that the Nandas invaded Kaliṅga. These facts give sufficient weight to the Purāṇic testimony.

However, none of the kingdoms that Mahāpadma Nanda is supposed to have uprooted can definitely be located in Rajasthan though many of them such as Haihayas, Śūrasenas and Vītihotras were occupying areas adjacent to this region.[5] However, the possibility that Rajasthan was also included in the vast Nanda empire cannot be ruled out. The fact Matsyas remain unheard in the countries immediately following the rise of the Nandas points to the same direction. But such a presumption would not be based on definite evidence. Further, the fact that the Matsyas, whose kingdom was in existence in the age of the Buddha, are not enumerated among the Kshatriya families uprooted by the great Nanda emperor would go against the assumption of the Nanda rule over Rajasthan. We, therefore, feel that in the present state of our knowledge the question of Nanda suzerainty over Rajasthan should be left open.

Rajasthan was definitely included in mighty Maurya empire. The positive evidence in this respect comes from the Calcutta—Bairat (Bhabru) Stone Slab Inscription[6] and,

1. *ANM*, pp. 16 ff.
2. Pargiter, *DKA*, p. 23.
3. Mc Crindle, J.W., *The Invasion of India by Alexander the Great as described by Q. Curtius, Diodorus, Plutarch and Justin* (tr., Westminister, 1896) pp. 221-22.
4. Sircar, D.C., *Select Inscriptions bearing on Indian History and Civilization*, Vol. I, pp. 213 ff.
5. *ANM*, pp. 17-20.
6. Pandey, R.B., *Aśoka ke Abhilekha*, Varanasi, V.S. 2022, p. 115.

Bairat Minor Rock Inscription[1] of Aśoka. Indirectly it is proved by the fact that the Magadhan empire expanded as far west as Surāshṭra as is indicated by the Sopara Rock Edict[2] of Aśoka and the Junagarh Rock Inscription of Rudradāman I dated Śaka Year 72 (150 A.D.).[3] Further, it may be noted that all the areas around Rajasthan, viz., U.P., Panjab, Sindh, Gujarat and Malwa were included in the Maurya empire. In such a situation it can hardly be maintained that Rajasthan alone remained outside the dominion of the Mauryas.

But the question regarding the identity of the first Maurya conqueror of this part of the country is rather difficult to answer. We feel that it was most likely Chandragupta Maurya himself. Firstly, he is known to have pushed the frontiers of his empires as far as Surāshṭra or Kathiawar in the west. This is attested to by the Junagarh Rock Inscription of the Mahākshatrapa Rudradāman which refers to Chandragupta's Rāshṭriya or High Commissioner Vaiśya Pushyagupta, who constructed the famous Sudarśana lake.[4] The incorporation of this region within the Magadhan empire, argues Raychaudhuri, "implies control over Avanti or Malwa".[5] Ujjain, the capital of Avanti, long remained the seat of a Maurya viceroyalty. Jain writers include the 'Muriyas' or Mauryas among the successors of Pālaka of Avanti.[6] It is quite obvious that Chandragupta Maurya could have hardly extended his suzerainty up to Surāshṭra and Avanti without establishing his hold over Rajasthan. Now the inscriptions of Aśoka credit him only with the conquest of Kaliṅga.[7] But the geographical distribution of his epigraphs as well as their internal evidence shows that his empire extended up to Mysore

1. Panday, R. B. *Ibid.*, p. 114.
2. *Ibid.*, 109.
3. Sircar, D C., *SI.*, pp. 175 ff.
4. *Loc. cit.*
5. *ANM*, p. 155.
6. Jacobi, *Kalpasūtra of Bhadrabāhu*, 1879, p. 7; *Pariśishṭaparvan*, ed. by Jacobi, p. xx, quoted by H.C. Raychaudhuri, in *ANM*, p. 155 fn. 3. Chandragupta Maurya has been referred to as the 'lord of Ujjayani' by a Jain text *Ārādhanākathā Kosha* of Nemidatta.
7. Rock Edicts XIII, Pandey, R.B., *op. cit.*, p. 58.

in the south and Kandhar in the north-west.[1] Aśoka's father Bindusāra Amitraghāta is not known to history as a conqueror and is supposed to have been a man of peaceful temperament interested in wine, figs and philosophy.[2] It thus stands to reason that the empire over which Aśoka ruled was mostly the creation of his grandfather Chandragupta Maurya.[3] This conclusion is quite in keeping with the accounts of the Classical writers. According to them, after the liberation of Panjab by putting to death of the prefects of Alexander, Chandragupta collected a huge army and conquered the whole country. Plutarch tells us that "Androcottus (Chandragupta Maurya) who had by that time mounted the throne...overran and subdued the whole of India with an army of 600,000 men."[4] Justin also informs us that he was "in possession of India."[5] The *Mudrārākshasa* describes him as the "king over all Jambudvīpa", and sole monarch of the country that extends "from the lord of the mountains (*Śailendra*, i.e. the Himalayas), cooled by showers of the spray of the divine stream (*Gaṅgā*) playing about among its rocks, to the shores of the Southern ocean (*dakshiṇārṇava*) marked by the brilliance of gems flashing with various colours."[6]

The Maurya conquest of Rajasthan marked a turning point in the history of this region. Though it had experienced the influx of neighbouring tribes and peoples and occasional rule of neighbouring kings even in earlier periods, it was for the first time in the Maurya age that Rajasthan became an integral part of an all-India empire and experienced the pleasures and pains of being a part of the main stream of national life. The best evidence for this transformation is

1. *PHAI*, pp. 307-315; *AIU*, pp. 77-78.
2. McCrindle, *Invasion of India by Alexander the Great*, p. 409.
3. *AIU*, p. 61.
4. *The Classical Accounts of India*, ed. by R.C. Majumdar, p. 198.
5. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 193; *PHAI*, p. 269; *ANM*, p. 137.
6. Act. III., verse 19 quoted in the *ANM*, p. 156. For details, see, Mookerji, R.K. *Chandragupta Maurya and his Times* Ch. II; Raychaudhuri, H.C., *PHAI*, pt. II, Ch. IV; *ANM*, Ch. IV; *AIU*, pp. 57-62.

provided by the inscriptions of Aśoka. For example, the Bhabru edict found in the Jaipur division refers to the jurisdiction of the Magadhan Buddhist Church in Rajasthan.[1] Further, it refers to a number of Buddhist texts[2] the study of which was enjoined by Aśoka for the monks, the nuns as well as the laity. The reference to these sacred texts is significant not only from the point of view of the history of Buddhism and its literature but also from the point of view of the cultural history of Rajasthan; for it proves that Rajasthan was greatly influenced by the missionary activities of Aśoka as well as Buddhist *saṅgha*. It appears that Buddhism had acquired strong roots in this part of the country in the third century B.C. The impact of Buddhism must have brought about some significant changes in the cultural life of the people as in the earlier period, this area was a great centre of the Brahmanical religion. Actually, it continued to give greater patronage to Brahmanical faiths even in the later period.

The empire of Aśoka declined and disintegrated within half a century after his death (236 B.C.).[3] His successors continued to occupy the imperial throne till 185 B.C.[4] The dynasty ended with the assassination of Brihadratha, its last king, by his general Pushyamitra Śuṅga. During the later

1. पियदसि लाजा मागधं संघं अभिवादेतनं आहा···
Some scholars such as Hultzsch take the word *Māgadha* to be an adjective of *lājā*. But in the Aśokan epigraphs the adjectives of *lājā* usually precede it. Cf. Pandey, R.B., *op. cit.*, p. 115.

2. इमानि भंते धंम पलियायानि विनयसमुकसे
अलिय वसाणि अनागतभयानि मुनिगाथा
मोनेयसुते उपतिसपसिने ए चा लाघुलो-
वादे मुसावादं अधिगिच्य भगवता बुधेन भासिते
एतानि भंते धंम पालियायानि इछामि किंति बहुके
भिखुपाये चा भिखुनिये चा अभिखिनं सुनेयु चा
उपधालयेयू चा हेवंमेवा उपासका चा उपासिका चा···
Pandey, R.B., *op. cit.*, p. 115 and fn. p. 116.

3. *AIU*, pp. 88-89 and App., pp. 92-94.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 90.

Mauryas distant provinces of the empire became independent one after another.[1] What happened in Rajasthan in the age of the decline of the Mauryas is not definitely known. However, according to the Jain sources Pushyamitra Śuṅga, the founder of the Śuṅga dynasty, who succeeded to the imperial throne of Magadha after the Mauryas in 185 B.C., was the governor of Ujjayanī before he murdered his royal master. Further, according to some Purāṇas,[2] Pushyamitra ruled for 60 years while according to others he was on the throne for only 36 years.[3] The Jain sources have given him a reign period of 30 years—but in connection with the history of Malwa. Therefore, it has been very plausibly suggested that his reign of 60 years includes the period of his governorship of Malwa as well as the period when he was dejure emperor of Magadha. If this surmise is correct it would follow that Pushyamitra ruled as a governor of the Maurya emperors over West Malwa and obviously the adjoining regions of South Rajasthan in the post Aśokan Maurya epoch.[4]

1. According to *Rājataraṅgiṇī* (I, 115-17), Aśoka's son Jālauka made himself an independent king in Kashmir and conquered the country upto Kanauj. He is said to have crushed the invading Mlechchha horde'. According to Tārānātha Vīrasena, another successor of Aśokā, carved out an independent kingdom in Gandhāra. The *Mālavikāgnimitra* of Kālidāsa testified to the independence of Vidarbha in the age of Brihadratha. The Greek writer Polybius, refers to Sophagasenus (Subhāgasena) as an independent king on north-western frontiers of India at the time of the invasion of Antiochus III (206 B.C.); cf. *PHAI*, pp. 361-62; *ANM*, pp. 243-246; *Comp. Hist. Ind.*, II, pp. 43-47. For details, vide, Thapar, R., *Aśoka and the Decline of the Maurya*, Ch. VI and VII.

2. *DKM*, p. 70 fn. 12.

3. Therāvalī by Merutuṅga as quoted in *EHNI*, pp. 8-9.

4. The *Matsya Purāṇa* assigns a rule of 36 years to Pushyamitra while the *Vāyu* and the *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇas* assign 60 years. Here it may be noted that while the Purāṇas give a period of 137 years to the Mauryas, the Jaina writer Merutuṅga splits it into two parts i.e. 108 years for the Mauryas and 30 years for Pushyamitra. Merutuṅga is a late writer (fourteenth century A.D.). His statement may, therefore, not be correct. But as pointed out by R.C. Majumdar (*IHQ*, I, pp. 91 ff), the Jain account was written from the point of view of Avanti while

The Śuṅga period witnessed many important developments which greatly influenced the course of the history of Rajasthan. The most prominent event was the invasion of the Yavanas which was also the direct cause of the arrival of a large number of tribes from the Panjab to this part of the country. The Yavanas, i.e. the Greeks had established an independent kingdom in Bactria in the middle of the third century B.C. when Aśoka was presiding over the destiny of India. The founder of this kingdom was Diodotus I[1] whose son Diodotus II was overthrown by one Euthydemus who in turn had to face the invasion of the Seleucid emperor Antiochus III between c. 208 and 206 B.C. However on account of the efforts mainly of Demetrius, the son of Euthydemus, the independence of the Bactrian kingdom was saved. Towards the end of his rule Euthydemus extended his sway over some parts of north-western India.[2] But the man who established Greek supremacy over the Indian soil seems to have been his son Demetrius who proved to be a great conqueror. There is some controversy regarding the identity of Demetrius, the conqueror of India. W.W. Tarn[3] identified him with the son of Euthydemus while A.K. Narain[4] gives the credit of widespread conquests in India to another king of the same name. Be whatever it may, it is certain that the Greeks invaded the very heartland of India. The *Yuga Purāṇa* section of the *Gārgī Saṁhitā* speaks of a Yavana invasion of North India sometime after the reign of the Maurya king Śālisūka (c. 200 B.C.)[5]

the Purāṇas deal with the history of Pāṭaliputra. Therefore, longer reign period of Pushyamitra might have consisted of two different periods, the period of his governorship at Vidiśā under the Mauryas (when he was *de facto* ruler of the whole empire) and the period of his *de jure* rule as emperor after he overthrew Brihadratha. Sten Konow also has split up the reign of Pushyamitra into two parts—30 years of rule in Malwa and 6 years in Magadha (quoted in *Comprehensive History of India*. Vol. II, p. 100 fn. 1; cf. Pargiter, *DKA*, pp. 30-33, 70).

1. The accession of Diodotus I is usually placed in c. 255 B.C.
2. *AIU*, p. 105.
3. Tarn, W.W., *The Greeks in Bactria and India*, p. 155.
4. Narain, A.K., *The Indo-Greeks*, pp. 28 ff.
5. *AIU*, p. 106.

in the following words: "Then the viciously valiant Greeks, after reducing Sāketa, the Pañchāla country and Mathurā, will reach (or take) Kusumadhvaja".[1] Patañjali, who was a contemporary of Pushyamitra Śuṅga,[2] also refers to Yavana expedition in his *Mahābhāshya* while illustrating the use of the affix *laṅ*, which denotes an action that happened out of sight in the absence of the narrator. Patañjali gives the example, "the Yavana besieged Sāketa (Ayodhyā), the Yavana besieged Madhyamikā (near Chitor)."[3] From our point of view the testimony of the *Mahabhāshya* is very important because it explicitly refers to the occupation of Madhyamikā in Rajasthan by the Yavanas. This invasion took place either before the accession of Pushyamitra Śuṅga or in the initial years of his reign. However the Śuṅga monarch was successful in repulsing the invaders. It is quite likely that the internal dissensions among the Greeks themselves were mainly responsible for their debacle.[4] Anyway, it cannot be denied that Pushyamitra Śuṅga succeeded in establishing his authority up to the river Indus. Rajasthan, at that time, was ost likely included in his empire, though it is very fficult to prove this supposition.[5] At any rate, it must

1. *JBORS*, XIV, 1928, p. 402; cf. Narain, A.K., *op. cit.*, App. IV pp. 174-179.
2. *AIU*, p. 107.
3. अरुणाद् यवनः साकेतम् ।
   अरुणाद् यवनः मध्यमिकाम् ।
   Mahābhāshya, III, 2.111.
4. According to the *Gārgī-Saṁhitā* (*JBORS*, XIV, 1923, p. 403) there will be undoubtedly a civil war among them, arising in their own country, there will be a very terrible and a ferocious war". This shows that the Yavanas who besieged Pāṭaliputra did not stay for a long time in Madhyadeśa. The Greeks appear to have lost Madhyadeśa and parts of Panjab and the lower Sindhu valley to Pushyamitra at least temporarily. (cf. *AIU.*, pp. 95-97 and 107).
5. From the testimony of *Mālavikāgnimitra* of Kālidāsa it appears that at the time when Agnimitra, the son of Pushyamitra, was ruling over Vidiśā as the governor of his father, Vasumitra, son of Agnimitra and grandson of Pushyamitra, was the commandar of the Śuṅga army

have felt the impact of the main current of the Śuṅga Greek rivalry.

The invasion of India by the Greeks was a landmark in the history of the country. It was also an event of far-reaching consequences from the point of view of the history of Rajasthan. It started the process of migration of a large number of tribes from the Panjab into this region. Rajasthan, as we have noted earlier was a sort of *cul-de-sac* where people from the adjoining regions used to take shelter whenever they were pressed hard by the imperialist powers of the Ganga Valley or the invaders from the north-west. It happened on a grand scale in this period when Mālavas, Śibis, Ārjunāyanas, Ābhīras, etc., of Punjab migrated into various parts of Rajasthan when they were pressed hard by the Greeks.

The history of the tribes that entered Rajasthan in the Śuṅga-Kaṇva period is not sufficiently known, based as it is mainly on the numismatic data, a few inscriptions and some scattered literary references. However, as a result of the research work of modern scholars during the last hundred years or so we are in a position to present a broad outline of the circumstances leading to the migration of these tribes into Rajasthan. In other words we can now try to bring into focus the main features of the picture of the political geography of Rajasthan in the Śuṅga-Kaṇva period.

which accompanied the horse of the *Aśvamedha* performed by the Śuṅga monarch. As at that time Vasumitra was mature enough to lead the imperial forces, it may be assumed that this event took place towards the close of Pushyamitra's reign. This also suggests that the Śuṅga-Greek clash on the southern or right bank of the river 'Sindhu' which must be identified with the Indus (cf. the statement of the Buddhist writers that Pushyamitra made a declaration regarding the persecution of the Buddhist at Śākala) was different from the one reported by the *Mahābhāshya* and the *Gārgī Saṁhitā*. Further it indicates, though it does not conclusively prove, that Rajasthan, situated to the east of river Indus, was included in the Śuṅga empire under Pushyamitra.

The Mālavas

Let us first take up the history of the Mālavas. The Mālavas claimed descent from the illustrious Ikshvāku dynasty of Śrī Rāmchandra.[1] In the *Vālmīkiya Rāmāyaṇa* Malla has been mentioned as an epithet of Lakshmaṇa's son Chandraketu.[2] It is generally believed that Malla was the founder of the Malla rāshṭra. The word Malla is the Prakrit form of the word Madra as 'dṛ' is a changed form of 'll'[3]. That is why in the *Mahābhārata*[4] Mālavas have been described as the descendants of Aśvapati, the king of Madras, who is said to have obtained one hundred sons called 'the Mālavas' through his queen Mālavī as a result of one of the boons granted by Yama to the king's daughter Śāvitrī, married to the Śālva prince Satyavān. We shall discuss this problem presently.

The Mālavas were a tribe of famous warriors. According to the *Mahābhārata*, they helped the Kauravas against the Pāṇḍavas in many crucial battles. When Alexander invaded north-western India in the fourth century B.C., the Mālavas (called Malloi by the Classical writers) lived in the region lying to the north of the confluence of the Ravi and the Chenab and were probably confederated with the Kshudrakas (Oxydrakai or Sudracai of the Greek historians) who were inhabiting the Montgomery region of Panjab of modern

1. Altekar, A.S., *The State and Government in Ancient India*, p. 111; cf. Nāndsā Yūpa Inscriptions, *EI*. XXVII, pp. 252-69; *IHQ*; XXIX, pp. 80 ff.
2. *Rāmāyaṇa*, VII, 102.9.
3. Przyluski, J., *JA*, 1926, pp. 1 ff.
4. *Mahābhārata*, III. 296. 56-60 :

पितुश्च ते पुत्रशतं भविता तव मातरि ।
मालव्यां मालवा नाम शाश्वताः पुत्रपौत्रिणः ॥

Cf. Harahā Inscription of Īśānavarman (554 A.D.), Sircar, D.C., *SI.*, p. 386; *IC*, I, pp. 298 ff. The Tradition also suggests that the Mālavas represented a branch of the Madra people of the Śialkot region, cf. Sircar, D.C., *Ancient Malwa and the Vikramāditya Tradition*, p. 20 fn. 22.

raka—Mālava as an example of the *dvandva* compound and refers to Āpiśali as speaking of Kshudraka—Mālavī (*senā*).[4] Further, both these tribes are mentioned together in the early Sanskrit literature.[5] The fact that the Mālavas lived in Panjab[6] is attested by the *Mahābhārata*. It states that Aśvapati, the king of Madradeśa, obtained one hundred sons called the Mālavas through his queen Mālavī as a result of a boon granted by Yama to Sāvitrī, the daughter of Aśvapati.[7] Thus, according to this legend, the Mālavas who dominated the political scene of Rajasthan in the century preceding and following the birth of Christ were originally a branch of the Madras of Panjab.

In Panjab the Mālavas developed a fairly advanced state of civilization and their description by the Classical writers speak volumes for their greatness and prosperity. According to the Classical writers, the envoys of the Mālavas and Kshudrakas brought very rare and sumptuous gifts to Alexander. The presents included four-horsed chariots (the number being 1030 or 500), one thousand locally manufactured bucklers, one hundred talents of white iron (probably steel or nickel), a large quantity of linen goods, three hundred horse-men, some tortoise shells, skins of large lizards (crocodiles) and tame

1. Raychaudhuri, H.C., *PHAI*, pp. 254-55.
2. Gupta, P.L., *Gupta Sāmrājya*, pp. 262-63.
3. *Mahābhāshya*, IV, 2.45.
4. V, 3.114. cf. Weber, *JASB.*, pt. I, Vol. Lxi, 1892, p. 60. For critical analysis vide Jayaswal, K.P., *Hindu Polity* (third ed. Bangalore, 1955), p. 60 fn. 1.
5. Smith, V.A. *EHI*, p. 98 fn. 1.
6. *PHAI*, pp. 254-55.
7. *Mahābhārata*, III, 296, 59-60.

The M

and tigers.[1] In this list coins are conspicuous by their ence. It shows that by this time they had not developed a currency system of their own. They were mainly devoted to agriculture. Probably their economy depended upon the exploitation of slaves, for Patañjali remarks that only the members of the ruling class among the Mālavas and the Kshudrakas were called Mālavya and Kshaudrakya ; the slaves and free labourers were not permitted to use these titles.[2] Thus it appears they had a privileged aristocracy which looked after the administration and enjoyed the fruits of the labour of the slaves and others. The Mecedonians were very much impressed by the appearance of the Mālavas as "they were of great stature and were amongst the tallest men in Asia. Their complexion was black, but they were simple in their habits."[3]

From the evidence of the Classical writers it appears that the Mālavas and the Kshudrakas were ordinarily at war with each other. But at the time of the invasion of Alexander they resolved to forget old enmity and make common cause against the invader.[4] According to Diodorus, the two tribes cemented their alliance by large scale inter-marriages by giving and taking in exchange ten thousand young women for wives.[5] This information is of great significance for after the

1. For details, vide, Majumdar, R.C., *Classical Accounts of India*, II, (especially, accounts of Arrian and Curtius) pp. 5 ff; cf. Smith, V.A., *EHI*, p. 102 fn. 1; for the Mālavas' struggle with Alexander, *Ibid.*, pp. 98-102.

2. *Mahābhāshya*, IV. 1.168.

इदं तर्हि क्षौद्रकाणामपत्यं मालवानामपत्यमिति ।
अत्रापि क्षौद्रक्यः मालव्य इति नैतत्तेषां दासे वा
भवति कर्मकरे वा । किं तर्हि ? तेषामेव कस्मिश्चित् वा ।

It is interesting to note, however, that the Mālavas do not find mention in Pāṇini's *Ashṭādhyāyī*. The absence of Mālavas in the *Ashṭādhyāyī* may be due to the fact that they had not attained sufficient importance in the time of the great grammarian.

3. Mc Crindle, J.W., *Invasion of India by Alexander the Great*, p. 85; cf. Das Gupta, K.K., *The Mālavas*, pp. 26-27; Jayaswal, K.P., *Hindu Polity*, p. 178.

4. Smith, V.A., *EHI*, p. 99.

5. Majumdar, R.C., *Classical Accounts of India*, p. 176; for details regarding the Malloi-Oxydrakai confederacy and their fate against Alexander, vide, Smith, V.A., *op. cit.*, pp. 99-112.

invasion of Alexander the Kshudrakas do not figure in our sources. Probably the Mālavas, who migrated to Rajasthan in the post-Alexanderian period, were a mixed tribe comprising both Mālavas and Kshudrakas. It may explain the vigour with which the Mālavas colonized and dominated large tracts of Rajasthan for centuries together.

From Panjab the Mālavas might have moved towards Rajasthan by way of Bhatinda where their name seems to have survived in the Malawai dialect found prevalent in the region extending from Ferozepur to Bhatinda.[1] In Rajasthan they settled down in the Jaipur division as the discovery of their coins as well as inscriptions from their region proves.

The Śibis

The Śibis (the Siboi of the Classical writers), another tribe of Panjāb, which resisted Alexander on his return march, entered Rajasthan separately or alongwith the Mālavas but in the same general period. They were also an ancient people. They are generally identified with the Śivas, a tribe of the *Rigveda*, which is said to have been defeated by the king Sudās in the Dāśarājña.[2] They were intimately connected with Uśīnara *janapada*.[3] At one time their government was monarchical in character as is evident from the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* which knows of a Śibi king.[4] This fact is further corroborated by the *Gītā* which mentions their king Śaibya,[5] and also by the *Vishṇu-Dharmottara Mahāpurāṇa* which mentions king Prabhadraka of the Śibis as ruling somewhere to the west of the

1. Grierson, *Linguistic Survey of India*, IX, i, p. 709. quoted by K.K. Das Gupta in *the Mālavas*, p. 4 fn. 38; cf. Sharan, M.K, *Tribal coins—A Study*, pp. 180-181.

2. *Vedic Index*, II, pp. 381-82. There can hardly be any doubt as to the identity of the Rigvedic Śivas with the Siboi of the Classical writers.

3. *Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra* (III, 53; 22) quoted by B.C. Law in *Tribes in Ancient India*, p. 82; it is not altogether improbable, therefore, that the Uśīnara country was at one time the home of the Śivis (*PHAI*, p. 253).

4. *Vedic Index*, II, pp. 381-82.

5. *Gītā*, I.5.

Yamuna.[1] The *Mahābhārata*[2] also refers to a *rāshṭra* of the Śivis, ruled by king Uśīnara, which according to Cunningham lay not far from Yamuna.[3] The *Praśnopanishad* refers to a certain Śaibya Satyakāma (Satyakāma, the Śibiputra) who asked a question to Pippalāda.[4] Patañjali mentions Śibayaḥ and Vasatayaḥ together as names of countries, and Śivapura as a township in the north.[5] Śivipur or Śibipur has been identified by Vogel[6] with Shorkot in the Jhang District of West Pakistan below the confluence of the Jhelum and the Chenab. An inscription dated G.E. 83 (A.D. 402-3) discovered from Shorkot refers to Śivipura[7] and hence Shorkot should be taken as the capital of the Śibis of Panjab.

In the fourth century B.C. the Śibis appear to have been rather a backword people, for, according to Curtius, when Alexander invaded them, "they dressed themselves with the skins of wild beasts, and had clubs for their weapons."[8] They submitted to the Macedonian conqueror who allowed them to retain their freedom.[9] However, when they found that their freedom was in danger they migrated from Panjab to Raja-

1. *Vishṇu Dharmottara Mahāpurāṇa*, I.207, 11-13.
2. III, 130-31; II, 32.7; 52.14.
3. Cunningham, A., *Ancient Geography of India*, pp. 160-61. The *Mahābhārata* (Sabhā, 32.7) mentions them with Trigarttas and Mālavas as hostile to Nakula, and as paying tribute to Yudhishṭhira along with the Trigarttas and Yaudheyas (*Ibid*, 52.11). However the Jātakas connect them with Sauvīra which is practically the same locality where the Greeks saw them (*Comp. Hist. Ind.* II, p. 125). A Śibi king became the ideal of self sacrifice in Hindu and Buddhist legends (Allan, J., *Catalogue of the coins of Ancient India in the British Museum*, London, 1936, Intro. sect. 142-43; cf. Law, B.C., *op. cit.*, p. 84 and fn. 2).
4. *Praśnopanishad*, 5.1.
5. *Mahābhāshya*, IV. 2, 52 and 104; cf. Agrawala, V.S., *Pāṇinī Kālīna Bhāratavarsha*, pp. 41, 68, 484-85.
6. *JPHS*, I, p. 174, quoted by Smith in *EHI*, p. 97 fn. 2.
7. *EI*, XVI, p. 75; Bhandarkar, *List*, 2035.
8. Majumdar, R.C., *Classical Accounts of India*, p. 136.
9. Smith, V.A., *EHI*., p. 97.

sthan alongwith several other tribes.[1] In Rajasthan they settled down in Chitor region, and probably on account of the impact of the Greeks, very soon became quite advanced with a money-economy of their own, as the discovery of their coins bearing the legend *Majhimikaya Sibi Janapadas* (Śibi Janapada of Madhyamikā) found at Nagari near Chitor proves. Nagari of modern times was celebrated in antiquity as Madhyamikā.[2] It must have been in existence even before it was occupied by the Śibis, for a large number of punch-marked coins found from this site carry its antiquity back to perhaps fifth century B.C.[3] It has also been mentioned in the *Mahābhārata* in connection with the conquest of Nakula over the Vaṭadhānas,[4] and the *Mahābhāshya* of Patañjali which makes the celebrated reference to the Greek invasion of Madhyamikā (Aruṇad Yavanaḥ Sāketam; *aruṇad Yavanaḥ Madhyamikām*).[5] To this general period may also be assigned the famous Ghosundi Stone Inscription[6] also known as Hathi Bada Inscription[7] (found near Nagari, 8 miles north of Chitorgarh in the former Udaipur state) of the king Sarvatāta, son of a lady of the Parāśara *gotra*. He is said to have performed an Aśvamedha and constructed a *pujāśilāprākāra,* probably styled Nārāyaṇa Vāṭaka in honour of Saṁkarshaṇa and Vāsudeva.[8] Madhyamikā (modern Nagari near Chitor), the place where the Aśvamedha was performed must have been the

1. The Vrishṇis also left Mathura and went to Dvārakā when they were pressed by Jarāsandha.
   Cf. Jayaswal, K.P., *Hindu Polity*, p. 66.
2. For details, vide Jain, K.C., *Ancient Cities and Towns of Rajasthan*, pp. 94-100.
3. *Archaeological Survey of India, Report*, VI, p. 197 quoted in *PRHC* 1967, p. 29.
4. Vaṭadhānas are identified by some scholars with the Śuṅgas on the ground that Vaṭa and Śuṅga, both meaning a banyan tree, are synonyms (Sharma, D. *RTA*, I, p. 50 fn. 1).
5. iii. 2, 111, ed. Kielhorn, II, p. 119.
6. *EI*, XVI, pp. 25-27.
7. *Ibid.*, XXII, pp. 198-205.
8. (कारितोयम् राज्ञा भागव) तेन गाजायनेन पाराशरीपुत्रेण स
   (र्वतातेन अश्वमेधयाजिना भगव (द्) भ्यां संकर्षणवासुदेवाभ्यां
   (अनिहताभ्यां सर्वेश्वरा) भ्यां पूजाशिलाप्राकारो नारायणवाटिका
   —*EI*, XXII, p. 204.

capital of Sarvatāta, who must have been an independent monarch as only such sovereigns were entitled to perform this sacrifice.[1]

The inscription of Sarvatāta is important from the point of view of the history of the evolution of early Vaishṇavism. Firstly, it is the earliest epigraph from Rajasthan which throws light on this religion. Secondly, it provides the first definite reference to the identification of Nārāyaṇa with Vāsudeva. Thirdly, it makes mention of the worship of Saṁkarshaṇa and Vāsudeva and thus provides an important landmark for the history of the *vyūha* doctrine. And, lastly, it refers to the *pūjā* of a *Śilā* among the worshippers of Vāsudeva.[2]

The Ārjunāyanas

In the Śuṅga-Kaṇva period the north-eastern part of Rajasthan i.e. the area of the former Bharatpur and Alwar

1. Some scholars such as J.C. Ghosh (quoted in *EI*, XXII, p. 205), believe that Sarvatāta was a Kaṇva king. But there is absolutely no evidence to prove that such was the case. Kaṇvas did not have anything to do with Rajasthan. Further, the name Sarvatāta (Sanskrit Sarvatrāta) does not figure in the Purāṇic list of Kaṇva kings (Sircar, *SI*, p. 91, fn. 1). The suggestion that the Gājāyana *gotra* to which Sarvatāta belonged should be identified with the Gādāyana or Godāyana *gotra* mentioned in the *Matsya Purāṇa* as an individual *gotra* or with Gaṅgāyana of the Sanaka or Kasyapa group, is also untenable. These are mere conjectures which cannot be upheld or denied in the present state of our knowledge (vide Jain, K.C., *Ancient cities and Towns of Rajasthan*, p. 95, fn. 1.). This may be noted, however, that Pārāśara Brāhmaṇas, to whose family the mother of Sarvatāta belonged, are still found in large number in the Pushkar region near Ajmer.
2. The exact significance of the term *pūjā-śilā-prākāra* is not known. D.R. Bhandarkar translates it as "a stone enclosure round an object of worship" (*EI*. XXII, p. 201). J.C. Ghosh believes that it refers to "a rampart for the stone object" (which he identifies as *Śāligrāma* of vaishṇava worship (*IHQ*, IX, p. 766). However the best suggestion has come from V.S. Agrawala (*Nāgarī Prachāriṇī Patrikā*, V.S. 2014, pp. 116 ff.), who suggests that in that period the Vaishṇavas worshipped stone slabs (*pūjā śilās*) of the type of the *āyagapaṭṭas* of the Jains and that Sarvatāta constructed an enclosure (*prākāra*) for the worship of such a *pūjā śilā*. The tradition of constructing such enclosures goes back to the days of Aśoka who built a *śilā vigaḍabhīcha* at Lumbini. Cf. Bhandarkar, D.R., *EI*, XXII, pp. 202-203; Agrawala, R.C., *Nāgarī Prachāriṇī Patrikā*, V.S. 2011, pp. 116 ff.; Srivastava, V.S., *Maru Bhāratī*, year 11, pt. 2, 1963, pp. 46 ff.

states and the adjoining parts of U.P. west of Agra and Mathura, was occupied by the famous tribal republic of the Ārjunāyanas. They probably claimed descent from the Pāṇḍava prince Arjuna or the Haihaya king of that name.[1] Pāṇini in his *Ashṭādhyāyī* refers to Ārjunakas, i.e., the devotees of Arjuna together with the worshippers of Vāsudeva called Vāsudevaka.[2] It means that Arjuna was treated as a deity by a section of the people in the age of Pāṇini. But it is not certain if the Ārjunāyanas of Rajasthan and U.P. were the decendants of the Ārjunakas of the celebrated grammarian. Similarly, their identification with the Prārjunas of the Prayāga *praśasti* of Samudragupta[3] and Prājjunakas (Prārjunakas) of Kauṭilya,[4] suggested by Buddha Prakash,[5] can hardly be accepted as the Prayāga *praśasti* enumerates the Ārjunāyanas and the Prārjunas in the same list separately. It is, however, probable that the Ārjunāyanas and the Prārjunas both were the splinter groups of an ancient tribe which regarded itself as the descendant of Arjuna just as the Yaudheyas looked upon themselves as the descendants of Yaudheya, a son of Yudhishṭhira. Buddha Prakash has also suggested that Ārjunāyanas were a Scythian tribe. He has pointed out that some oases-states of the Tarim basin in Central Asia dotting the northern trade route, running from Kashghar to Tun-huang, were constantly associated with the name of Arjuna.[6] But the evidence cited by him is hardly sufficient to prove the point.

T

Mathu

1. *AIU*, p. 162. In view of the fact that the contemporary Yaudheya tribe is supposed to have claimed descent from Yudhishṭhira Pāṇḍava, the former alternative may be correct.
2. वासुदेवार्जुनाभ्यां वुन्, *Ashṭādhyāyī*, IV, 3.98; for a detailed analysis of this evidence vide, Agrawal, V.S., *Pāṇinikālīna Bhāratavarsha*, pp. 352 ff.
3. Sircar, D.C., *SI*, pp. 262 ff.
4. *Arthaśāstra*, III. 18, (ed. R. Shamasastri), p. 194.
5. Buddha Prakash, *Political and* ... *in Ancient* (Delhi, 1964), p. 93.
6. Buddha Prakash, *op. cit.*, p.

(victory to the Ārjunāyanas)[1] in the early Brāhmī script. According to McCrindle, they were known to the Classical writers as Agalassi or Agalassoi.[2] In that case it may be presumed that they migrated from the Panjab to north eastern Rajasthan and adjoining parts of U.P. along with their neighbours, the Siboi and the Malloi. The close association of the Malloi Siboi and the Agalassoi with each other becomes clear by the statement of the Classical writers that Alexander had to conquer the latter two tribes in order to prevent them from joining the powerful Malloi.[3]

The Yaudheyas

The Yaudheyas were perhaps the most important and the strongest tribe of northern Rajasthan. They also occupied the adjoining parts of western U.P. and south-eastern Panjab in the centuries immediately preceding and following the commencement of the Christian era. The forms *Yaudheya* or Yodheya are derived from *Yodha*, which signifies 'a warrior'.[4] In the *Mahābhārata* 'Yaudheya' appears as the name of a son of Yudhisthira,[5] the eldest of the Pāṇḍavas, and it is quite likely that the Yaudheyas claimed descent from the former.[6] They are mentioned in the *Ashṭādhyāyī* of Pāṇini and are grouped in this work with the Trigarttas, Bharatas, Uśīnaras and other people of the *āyudha-jīvī Saṅgha* category,[7] and are equated with the Parśus[8] (perhaps the Persians). The Purāṇas[9] connect them with the Uśīnaras, who dominated eastern Panjab in the post-Vedic period. On the basis

1. Cf. the legend, *Mālavānām jayaḥ* on the Mālava coins.
2. Quoted in the *Comp. Hist. Ind.*, II, p. 126; D. Sharma supports this suggestion (*RTA*, I, p. 49). Contra K. A.N. Sastri (*Comp. Hist. Ind.*, II, p. 126).
3. Cf. *Age of the Nandas and Mauryas*, p. 70.
4. *AIU*, p. 165.
5. *Mahābhārata* I, 95, 76. For a discussion see Cunningham, A., *Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Report*, XIV, p. 141.
6. Buddha Prakash has suggested the association of the Yaudheyas with Yudhishthira on linguistic grounds also, (*op. cit.*, pp. 103-5).
7. *Ashṭādhyāyī*, V, 3, 117; IV, 1, 178.
8. *Ibid.*, V. 3. 117.
9. Pargiter, F.E., *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa*, p. 380.

of the Purāṇic tradition, Pargiter suggests that king Uśīnara established the kingdoms of the Yaudheyas, Ambashṭhas, Navarāshṭras and the city Krimīla and his son Śiva founded the town of Śivipura.[1] Buddha Prakash believes that the Yaudheyas were a foreign tribe and were related with the Yautiyas of Laristan, the Ouitio of Transcaucasia and the Jut nomads of Kirman.[2] But this theory has nothing to commend itself to. The *Mahābhārata* refers to Rohitaka in the Bahudhānyaka region as their capital.[3] According to A.S. Altekar,[4] there were three federating units of the Yaudheya power : Rohtak in the Panjab was the capital of one; northern Pañchāla, known as Bahudhānyaka, was the centre of the second ; and northern Rajputana was occupied by the third. It appears that the heart of the Yaudheya republic was eastern Panjab, but it dominated over the adjoining regions of the U.P. and Rajasthan also.[5]

The coins of the Yaudheyas are available in six distinct classes each divisible into several varieties.[6] The earliest Yaudheya coins, which may be assigned to a period about the close of the first century B.C., bear the legend *bahudhānake Yodheyānām* (of the Yaudheyas of the Bahudhānyaka country). They were struck probably with the idea of emphasising the original home of the tribe. Other classes of the Yaudheya coins belonging to the later periods of their history, are discussed in the next chapter.

1. Pargiter, F.E., *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition*, p. 264.
2. Buddha Prakash, *op. cit.*, p. 105.
3. ततो वहुधनं रम्यं गवाढ्यं धनधान्यवत् ।
   कार्त्तिकेयस्य दयितं रोहीतकमुपाद्रवत् ॥
   तत्र युद्धं महच्चासीच् छरैर्मत्तमयूरके ।
   मरुभूमिस्तथान्येन तथैव वहुधान्यकम् ॥
   Mahābhārata, Sabhā, 32, 4-5.
4. Altekar, A.S., *State and Government in Ancient India*, p. 119.
5. *AIU*, p. 166.
6. For details see Allan, John, *A Catalogue of the Coins of Ancient India in the British Museum* (London, 1936), Int.; Smith, V.A., *Catalogue of the Coins in the Indian Museum*, Calcutta, Vol. I (Oxford, 1906).

of the Śūdras is also mentioned by the Classical writers. According to Diodorus, Alexander founded a city called Alexandria in the republic of Sodrai and planted a colony of 10,000 men there.[1] It appears that a part of these, north-western Śūdra people migrated towards Rajasthan along with other tribes mentioned above.

The Rājanyas

Originally the Rājanyas[2] lived in the Hoshiarpur district of Panjab, where their coins of the second and first century B.C. bearing the legend *rājana-janapadasa* (of the Rājanya *janapada*) have been found.[3] Perhaps they also migrated towards northern and north-western Rajasthan, for their coinage bearing legends both in the Brāhmī and Kharoshṭhī scripts[4] have also been discovered in the area lying between Bharatpur and Mathura, suggesring their occupation of this part of the country in the Śuṅga-Kaṇva period.

The Uddehikas

The *janapada* of the Uddehikas[5] was not very far from the Rājanya state. Varāhamihira places the Uddehikas in the Madhyadeśa,[6] but Alberuni locates them near Bazana in Bharatpur district.[7] Their coins bear the legend *Udehaki*.[8] One of the coins reveals the name of a certain Suyamita (Sūryamitra). The absence of any royal title for him suggests an

1. Majumdar, R.C., *Classical Accounts of India*, p. 181.
2. Here the term Rājanya is not synonym of Kshatriya, but is the name of a separate tribe. It was not noticed by the Classical writers in the fourth century B.C.; cf. Jayaswal, K.P., *Hindu Polity*, pp. 85 and 151.
3. Allan, J., *Catalogue of the Coins of Ancient India in the British Museum*, Int. p. 141.
4. *AIU*, p. 160 fn. 5.
5. For the term Udehaki for Auddehika, vide, Rapson, E.J., *JRAS*, 1900, p. 99.
6. *Bṛihat-Saṁhitā*, XIV, 3 (*IA*, XXII, p. 192), quoted in the *Comp. Hist. Ind.*, II, p. 134.
7. Allan, J., *op. cit.*; Sect. 47; cf. *AIU*, p. 159 fn. 3.
8. These coins are presently in the British Museum. Their provenance is however not known.

early date for this coin.[1] As these and other Uddehika coins have been assigned to the second half of the first century B. C., it may be presumed that the Uddehikas were active in this part of Rajasthan in the Śuṅga-Kaṇva period.

Many a tribe which migrated from Panjab into Rajasthan followed the Vedic cultural tradition (as is evidenced by the performance of the Vedic sacrifices by them), used Sanskrit language in their coin legends; claimed descent from ancient Vedic Kshatriya heroes and were recognised as true Kshatriyas by the authors of the *Mahābhārata*, etc. But it does not mean that racially and socially they were pure Vedic Kshatriyas. There are strong indications which suggest that in the centuries preceding and succeeding the Achaeminid invasions many waves of Iranian and Śaka invaders entered and settled down in Panjab and ultimately mixed with the Vedic Kahatriyas there. As pointed out earlier the Sālvas, the Madras and the Mālavas were related to each other quite closely[2]. According to the *Mahābhārata* the Madras and Śālvas both were the offspring of the king Vyushitāśva. It states that as a result of the divine favour seven sons were born to the queen of Vyushitāśva—three of whom were Śālvas and four Madras.[3] According to the *Kāśikā* the Madrakas were a part of Śālavāyava confederacy.[4] Further, the *Sāvitryupākhyāna* of the *Mahābhārata* records that the Madra princess Sāvitrī was married to Śālva prince Satyavān.[5] The close association of the Mālavas with Madras has already been noted above. The *Mahābhārata* believes that the Mālavas were the descendants of the Hundred sons of the Madra king Aśvapati.[6] Now, it can easily be shown that the Śālvas and Madras had been subjected to strong foreign influence in Panjab.[7] It means that the Śālvas

1. Allan, J., *op. cit.*, Sect. 167.
2. Cf. Przyluski, J., *Indian Studies: Past and Present*, Vol. II, No. 1, 1960, pp. 37 ff.
3. *Mahābhārata*, I. 121, 4695, quoted by Przyluski, *ibid.*, pp. 39, 45.
4. Agrawala, V.S., *Pāṇinikālīna Bhāratavarsha*, p. 72.
5. *Mahābhārata*, Vanaparva, 279.16.
6. *Mahābhārata*, III. 296.59-60.
7. For a detailed analysis, vide, Buddha Prakash, *Political and Social Movements in Ancient Panjab*, pp. 109-16.

and Mālavas, a branch of the Madras, who came to Rajasthan from Panjab, brought some foreign cultural elements with them According to Przyluski, the very name Vyushitāśva, the legendary ancestor of the Madras and Śālvas may be the Sanskritized form of the Iranian name Vistaspa, a name adopted also by the father of Darius.[1] The name Madra is itself equated with the Iranian name Mada or Mede.[2] In the *Mahābhārata* Mādrī, the queen of Pāṇḍu, is given the title Bālhikī.[3] In the *Mahāmāyūrī* the Yaksha Kharaposta is mentioned as the guardian deity of Bhadraśaila identified by Przyluski with Bhadrapura or Śākala, the capital of the Madras.[4] The very name Śākala or Sagala is also apparently derived from the name of Śaka tribe and is a strong proof of the arrival and settlement of the Śakas in the land of the Madras long before the advent of the later Śakas who entered India after the decline of the Indo-Greeks in the first century B.C.[5] The reference to the Yaksha Kharaposta in the *Mahāmāyūrī* is also very interesting, because the name Kharaposta was translated into Chinese as, skin of an ass,[6] and this meaning may be obtained only when we seek its origin in the Iranian word *post* meaning 'skin'.[7] All these facts strongly suggest that prior to their arrival in Rajasthan the Madras, Śālvas and the tribes allied to them had undergone strong Iranian influence.

Date of The Arrival of The Panjab Tribes In Rajasthan

The above-mentioned tribes left Panjab for Rajasthan definitely after the invasion of Alexander. But the exact period

1. Przyluski, *op. cit.*, p. 39.
2. Deb, H.K., Mede or Madra, *JRASB*, 1925, p. 205.
3. इत्युक्त्वा तं चिताग्निस्थं धर्मपत्नी नरर्षभम् ।
मदराजसुता तूर्णमन्वारोहद्यशस्विनी ॥
धन्या त्वमसि बाल्हीकि मत्तो भाग्यतरा तथा ।
Mahābhārata, I, 125, 25-31.
4. *Indian Studies : Past and Present*, Vol. II, No. 1, p. 40; Cf. Buddha Prakash, *op. cit.*, p. 112.
5. *Indian Studies : Past and Present*, Vol. II, No. 1, p. 39.
6. Cf. Levi, Sylvain, *JA*, 1915, I, pp. 39, 74.
7. Przyluski, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

of their migration is difficult to determine. Once these tribes were settled in Rajasthan many of them issued their own currency with legends in Brāhmī script. Therefore, if the initial date of these coins, specially those of the Mālavas, could be determined, the latest possible date of the arrival of these tribes in Rajasthan could be fixed with a reasonable degree of certainty. A review of these coins, therefore becomes quite important.

In the vast range of ancient Indian coinage, the coins of the Mālavas are "among the most curious and enigmatical".[1] Several thousands of these copper coins have been recovered from Rajasthan.[2] It is surprising that Panjab, the original home of the tribe, has not yielded any Mālava coins so far.[3] The Mālava coins from Rajasthan are all made of copper and majority of them bear their tribal name. Some coins contain a number of peculiar legends. Generally they are round in shape, though rectangular pieces are also not uncommon. They are broadly divisible into three classes. The first of them bears the legend *Mālavānāṁ jayaḥ* (i.e. victory to

1. Smith, V.A., *Catalogue of Coins in the Indian Museum, Calcutta*, Vol. I, (Oxford, 1906), p. 161.
2. The Mālava coins mainly come from Nagar or Karkoṭa Nagar (Ancient Mālavanagara) situated about 15 miles to the south-west of Uniyara Tehsil of the present Tonk District and from Rairh, 34 miles from Nagar and 56 miles from Jaipur. Carlleyle obtained more than six thousand coins from Nagar in 1871-72 and 1872-73 (for detailed discussion and analysis, vide Cunningham, A., *Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Reports*, Vol. VI, pp. 162 fn; Vol. XIV, pp. 149 ff.; Smith, *op. cit.*, pp. 160 ff; 170 ff; Allan, J., *A Catalogue of the Coins of Ancient India in the British Museum*, pp. CIV ff; Rapson, E.J., *Indian Coins*, pp. 12-13; Sircar, D.C, *Journal of the Numismatic Society of India* (1962), XXIV, pts. I and II, p. 1 ff). Over three hundred coins of the Mālavas were discovered in the course of excavation at Rairh. This site also yielded a lead seal which bears the legend *Mālava Janapadasa* (For details, vide Puri, K.N., *Excavations at Rairh*, V.S. 1995 and 1996, pp. 63 ff; also *Local Coins of Northern India* No. 2, 1968, pp. 23 ff.).
3. Coins of this class are small and light. The smallest one (2" in diameter and 1·7 grains in weight) of this class is considered to be the smallest known coin of the world. Cf. Smith, V.A., *op. cit.*, Coin No. 106.

the Mālavas) its variants being *Mālavagaṇasya jayaḥ* (i.e. victory to the Mālava republic), *Mālava jaya* (the Malavavictory), or *Mālavāna jaya*, *Malavana jaya*, *Mālavana jaya*, *Malavahna jaya* (victory to the Mālavas, in Prakrit, etc. One coin contains the legend *Mālava Sujaya* (the well-conquering Mālava). The other two classes are ascribed to the Mālavas primarily because they were found alongwith the Mālava coins and resemble the latter in fabric. The coins of the second class bear no legend while those of the third category have mysterious legends,[1] such as *Bhapaṁyana* (*Bhaṁpāyana* according to Jayaswal),[2] *Gajava*, *Gojara*, *Haraya* (supposed to stand for the royal title *Mahārāja* though *ma* is not clear),[3] *Jamaka*, *Jamaku*, *Jamapaya*, *Magacha*, *Magaja*, *Magajaśa*, *Magajava*, *Māśapa*, *Majupa*, *Mapaka*, *Mapojaya*, *Maraja*, *Masapa*, *Pachha*, *Paya*. *Yama* (may be read backward as *Maya*) etc. In the coin No.70 of Smiths Catalogue the legendu has Mālava and Mapojo both written from right to left. It may be regarded as an additional connecting link between the Mālavas and these coins.

Apart from these, Rairh has yielded a number of other interesting Mālava coins. Among them are included the lot of six copper coins bearing Ujjain symbol and legend *Senāpatis Vachhaghosa*.[4] Their shape, size and weight greatly vary. K.N. Puri, the excavator of Rairh, suggested that they were issued by some commander-in-Chief named Vachhaghosa (=Vatsaghosha) and associated him with Pushyamitra Śuṅga.[5] D.C. Sircar also thinks that Vachhaghosa was a *Senāpati* or a semi-independent provincial governor.[6] A.S. Altekar thinks that

1. No satisfactory explanation of these legends has been offered so far. Some scholars such as Smith (*op. cit.*, p. 161 ff.) consider them to be the names of the tribal chiefs of foreign origin, while scholars like Allan (*op. cit.*, pp. CIV-CVIII) take them to be meaningless attempts to reproduce parts of the legend *Mālavānāṁ jayaḥ*. Cf. Carlleyle, *op. cit.*, p. 174; Bhandarkar, *ABORI*, XXIII, p. 224; Sircar, *JNSI*, XXIV, pp. 3 ff. Dasgupta, K.K., *The Mālavas*, pp. 16-21.
2. Jayaswal, K.P., *Hindu Polity*, p. 381 (App.)
3. *Loc. cit.*; Cf. *ABORI*, XXIII, p. 224.
4. Puri, K.N., *Excavations at Rairh*, pp. 50-51.
5. *Loc. cit.*
6. Sircar, D.C., *JNSI*, IV, pp. 148-49.

he was perhaps a general of the Yaudheyas or the Ārjunāyanas.[1] We ourselves feel that in this matter the suggestion of K.K. Das Gupta deserves serious consideration. He believes that *Vachhaghosa* of these coins is a place name.[2] In this connection he cites the evidence of the *Bṛihatsaṁhitā* (XIV. 2) which uses this name as a place name: *Maru Vatsaghosha Yamuna Sārasvata Matsya Mādhyamikāḥ*. Therefore, on the analogy of some earlier coins found from the Bulandshahar district of U.P. on which the legend *Gamitasa bārānāva* occurs which may mean Gomitasa of Bārānāva, Das Gupta asserts, that "Vachhaghosha was the name of the mint town wherefrom the coins in question were issued by one *Senāpati* who was either a provincial governor of some unknown king or perhaps Pushyamitra Śuṅga."[3]

The site of Rairh also yielded some other rare coins, including a group of seven square copper coins bearing the legend *Vapu* on the obverse in Brāhmi script.[4] Puri believed that Vapu was probably a name of some unknown Mālava chief.[5] Another group of fourteen copper coins from Rairh reveals three *mitra* ending names (Sūryamitra, Brahmamitra and Dhruvamitra) and contains the additional legend *Sudavana*, which on one coin is replaced by the legend *Udehaki* while one specimen (of Brahmamitra) does not contain any addi-

1. Altekar, A.S., *Ibid*, XIII, No. 1, p 7. The suggestion is apparently wrong. Rairh was certainly included in the Mālava principality and was perhaps another capital of the Malavas. In any case it was not very far from Nagar (Mālavanagara) (*Excavations at Rairh*, p. 71, plate XXVI 22). Besides, we have from Rairh a seal bearing the legend *Mālava janapadasa*. Further, Puri collected about 280 coins from Rairh (*ibid*, p. 66) which definitely belong to the Mālavas. Cf. *Local Coins of Northern India*, No. 2, 1968, pp. 23-24.
2. Das Gupta, K.K., *JNSI*, XXVIII, No. 1, pp. 50-52.
3. Das Gupta, K.K., *Loc. cit.* We do not contribute to the latter part of his suggestion that these coins belong to the first Śuṅga emperor, Pushyamitra Śuṅga.
4. *Excavations at Rairh*, pp. 53, 68-69, plate, xxvi, 15-16.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 80.

question of the initial date of these coins some lowering it down to the age of Aśoka Maurya while others putting them a century or two later. We, therefore, believe that the initial date of these coins should be determined with the help of external evidence. In this connection the most important factor to be considered is the quantum of pressure which the foreign invaders exerted on the Panjab tribes pushing the latter towards Rajasthan. We feel that atleast politically the invasion of Alexander was merely an episode, the temporary effect of which was nullified by the extermination of Greek rule from Panjab by Chandragupta Maurya. Therefore, the view of D. Sharma that these tribal migrations were caused by the invasion of Alexander himself[1] is not tenable. On the other hand, the invasions of Panjab by the Indo-Greeks were constant in nature and resulted in prolonged foreign occupation of that region. It was, therefore, a far greater pressure on the Panjab tribes and could cause their migration into Rajasthan. To us it also appears quite likely that the Greek invasion on Madhyamikā in Rajasthan in the first half of the second century B.C., which has been mentioned by Patañjali in his *Mahābhāshya*,[2] was in the nature of the pursuit of these valiant tribes of the Panjab by the Greeks when the former were migrating into Rajasthan in order to retain their independence and self-respect. Here it may also be remembered that the fashion of mentioning the names of the ruling authority in the coinlegend was inspired and popularised in India by foreign kings beginning with the Indo-Greeks. In this situation Indian coins bearing such legends may hardly be assigned to a date much earlier than the middle of the second century B.C.

Thus we conclude that the Panjab tribes, discussed

1. Sharma, D., *RTA*, p. 49.
2. अरुणद् यवनः साकेतम् ।
   अरुणद् यवनः मध्यमिकाम् ।

   Mahābhāshya, III, 2.111, ed. Kielhorn, II, p. 119.

above, migrated into Rajasthan in the first half of the second century B.C. at the earliest and that the initial date of the coins issued by them should be put a few decades later than the middle of that century, for they must have taken some time to settle down in their new home before they could think of issuing their own currency.

CHAPTER II

RAJASTHAN IN THE SCYTHIAN PERIOD

The Political Background

The migration of the Mālavas into Rajasthan, along with many other tribes, took place, as we have seen,[1] some time in the early Śuṅga period. In Rajasthan the Mālavas settled down in the Ajmer-Tonk-Mewar region as has been proved by the discovery of a large number of coins and inscriptions from this area.[2] The course of their history in this part of the country was determined mainly by the nature of their relationship with other tribes and the states of Rajasthan and the impact of the fast changing political scene of the country. As discussed elsewhere,[3] Rajasthan is an area of relative isolation and it usually played the role of a temporary *col de sac* for the people who, when pressurised by the foreign tribes and indigenous powers of surrounding regions, used to take shelter in the sandy deserts and hills and forests of the Aravallis.[4] But even here they could not live in peace, for they were, time

1. *Supra*, Ch. 1.
2. For the discovery of the Mālava coins from this area vide, *NHIP*, p. 35 fn. 1.; Sharma, G.N., *Rājasthāna ke Itihāsa ke Srota*, pt. I, p. 20; *Rājasthāna kā Itihāsa*, pt. I, p. 20; *Local Coins of Northern India*, (No. 2), ed. by A.K. Narain, pp. 1-5; pp. 23-28; *JNSI*, Vol. XXVIII, pt. I, 1966, pp. 50-54; Vol. XXVIII, pt. II, 1966, pp. 203, 205. It is significant that Nāndsā, from where the inscriptions of Nandisoma and Bhaṭṭisoma (*EI*, XXVII, pp. 252-67) have been discovered, is located in Mewar.
3. Cf. *supra*, Ch. 1.
4. Cf. Sharma, Dasharatha, *RTA*, Vol. I, pp. 1-19; Ojha, G.H., *History of Rajputana*, pt. I, pp. 1-2, fn. 1; Sharma, G.N., *The Social Life in Medieval Rājasthan*, pp. 1-21, and 33.

and again, continued to be pressurised from the various directions by the ambitious neighbouring powers, especially the imperial powers of the Indus and Gangetic basins and the powerful states of Gujarat and the Deccan. Thus Rajasthan was always an area where political interests of the ruling powers of the Gangetic and Indus basins, western India and central Deccan clashed with each other. The history of the various tribes of Rajasthan in the early centuries of the Christian era was no exception to this general trend.

By the time the process of colonisation of the Ajmer-Tonk-Mewar region by the Mālavas was over (and it must have taken at least several decades), almost all the Indo-Greek kingdoms of the Panjab were well on the way of decline.[1] They were gradually displaced by the Śakas and Pahlavas who in turn were overthrown, at least in north-western and northern India, by the Kushāṇas in the second half of the first century.[2] The Kushāṇas succeeded in establishing a mighty empire which included large tracts of northern and north-western India and the adjoining countries.[3] They apparently succeeded in uprooting the imperial Śakas and Pahlavas of the North-West but the kingdom of the Śaka Kshatrapas of western India continued to exist even during the palmy days of Koshāṇa imperialism, though its relation with the Kushāṇa empire is rather difficult to be determined[4] We shall discuss this problem in detail later. Here it would be

1. For the history of the Indo-Greeks during the age of their decline and fall see Narain, A.K., *The Indo-Greeks*, Chs. V and VI (pp. 101 ff.).
2. *Ibid*; cf. *AIU*, Chs., VIII and IX; *Comp. Hist. India*, Vol. II, Ch VIII; Chattopadhyaya, S., *Early History of North India*, Ch. IV.
3. For a detailed history of the Kushānas, vide, *AIU*, Ch. IX; *Comp. Hist. Ind.*, II, Ch. VIII; Puri, B.N , *The Kushāṇas in India*; For a recent study of the Kushānas cf. Baldev Kumar, *The Early Kushāṇas*, New Delhi, 1973.
4. It is usually believed that the western Kshatrapas were subordinate to the Kushāṇas. But from the time of Rudradāman I the Western Kshatrapas appear to have become independent though they continued to adopt the title Mahākshatrapa which, in the earlier days, was indicative of subordinate status.

sufficient to remark that most likely the relationship between the Kushāṇa empire and the Śaka Kingdoms of western India continued to change from time to time according to the nature of circumstances in different periods. In the Scythian period, that is in the age when the Śakas and Kushāṇas dominated the North Indian political scene, the Satavāhanas of central Deccan enjoyed imperial status in the South.[1] Their rivalry with the Western Kshatrapas forms one of the most important themes of the history of the country in the early centuries of the Christian era. The result of the various phases of this struggle had immediate and important bearing on the history of Rajasthan. It is against this background that the history of the various tribes and states which dotted the landscape of this region in this period has to be studied.

Śaka-Mālava Struggle : The First Phase

The central theme of the history of Rajasthan in the early centuries of the Christian era was the struggle of the Mālavas against the Śakas—the latter trying to impose their suzerainty over the whole of Rajasthan and the former struggling to maintain their independence. The history of this struggle is extremely fascinating and its very first phase poses before modern historians one of the most interesting problems of ancient Indian history, viz. the problem of the historicity of Vikramāditya of legends.

According to the Jain tradition contained in the *Kālakāchāryakathānaka*[2] the Śakas entered western Malwa from Seistan via Sindh and Kathiawar during the reign of Gardabhilla (or Gardabhīla) of Ujjayanī and stayed in the city for four years: they were defeated and ousted from there by Gardabhilla's son Vikramāditya who founded the famous Vikrama (Krita-Māla) era of 57 B.C. The story of Vikramāditya is found in several different forms in a large number of

1. For the History of the Sātavāhanas, cf. *AIU*, Ch. XIII; *Comp. Hist. India*, II, Ch. X and XI.
2. *Śrikālakasūricharitam*, (verses 1 to 156) of the *Prabhāvakacharita* (ed. by Jinavijaya Muni), quoted in App. 1 of R.B. Pandey's *Vikramāditya*, Varanasi, 1960.

ancient Indian works.[1] Its various facets, most of which have nothing to do with our present problem, need not be discussed here.[2] If the Vikramāditya of legends is not a historical personality, a view to which we subscribe, a detailed discussion on his achievements will be pointless. For our present purpose it is sufficient to state that several imperial Gupta rulers assumed the title Vikramāditya and in many ways their achievements and personalities recall the legend of Vikramāditya. The evidence of the literary works of the Gupta and post-Gupta period may, therefore, be explained as having its origin in the cycle of stories which must have come into existence as a result of the achievements of the Gupta emperors. As regards the pre-Gupta literature, the Purāṇas which know all the mighty conquerors of the pre-Gupta period, and are also aware of the existence of the Gardabhillas[3] and the Śakas, do not refer to Vikramāditya at all. Actually, but for a Gāthā of a very doubtful date, found in the *Gāhā Sattasaī* of Hāla[4] and the claim that the now non-existent *Bṛihatkathā* of Guṇāḍhya contained a story based on the life of Vikramāditya[5]—a claim which cannot be proved or disproved in the absence of the work of Guṇāḍhya—no evidence for the existence of Vikramāditya *kathā* in the pre-Gupta period can possibly be adduced. It has been argued that though the original *Bṛhatkathā* which was composed in Prakrit, is now non-existent, three Sanskrit versions of this work are now available, i.e. the *Bṛihatkathāślokasaṅgraha* of Budhasvāmin (c. ninth

1. For a detailed account and analysis cf. Pandey, R.B., *op. cit.*, pp. 12-30. He believes in the historicity of Vikramāditya of legends. For other interpretations vide *Vikrama Volume*, Ujjain, 1948; Sircar, D.C., *Ancient Malwa and the Vikramāditya Tradition*, Delhi, 1969, Chs. VI and VII.
2. Cf. App. to this Chapter.
3. Pargiter, F.E., *The Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age*, p. 45.
4. संवाहनसुहरसतोसियेण देन्तेण तुह करे लक्खम् ।
   चलनेण विक्कमाइत्त-चरिमं मणुसिक्खियं तिस्सा ।।
   Gāthā, 664., quoted by Pandey, *op. cit.*, p. 12 fn. 1.
5. Winternitz, M., *A History of Indian Literature*, Vol. III, pt. I, p. 348; *Bhārata Kaumudī*, pt. II, pp 675 ff.

century), probably of Nepal, the *Bṛihatakathāmañjarī* of Kshemendra and the *Kathāsaritsāgara* of Somadeva, (both belonging to the eleventh century Kashmir). The fact that all these three works contain the story of Vikramāditya proves that the original *Bṛihatkathā* included a version of the Vikrmāditya saga. We beg to differ. For this line of argument only proves that the *Bṛihatkathā*, as it was known to Budhasvāmin, Somadeva and Kshemendra contained a version of the Vikramāditya story; it does not prove that the original *Bṛihatkathā* of Guṇāḍhya also contained this story. The volume of the *Bṛihatkathā*, like that of *Mahābhārata*, must have increased with the passage of time.[1] In other words, the volume of the original *Bṛihatkathā* must have been much smaller than the volume of this work which was available to the above mentioned Sanskrit scholars. Therefore, the possibility remains that the Vikramāditya legend was incorporated in the *Bṛihatkathā* some time after its initial composition and before the age of Budhasvāmin.[2] Here it may also be noted that in the first century B.C. the centre of the activities of the Mālavas was Kārakoṭanagara or Mālavanagara (modern Nagara in the former Uniyara Thikana in Jaipur District of Rajasthan) and not Ujjain, as the *Kālakāchāryakathānaka* and other ancient texts lead us to believe. Further, despite the fact that the Mālavas were the first Indian people to use the Mālava era, the belief in the Indian origin of this reckoning is not acceptable to many; at least quite a large number of modern historians do not contribute to the view that it was founded by the legendary Vikramāditya. They rightly point out that the names Mālava and Vikrama were not associated with this era till the fifth and the ninth century A.D., instead it was known as the Kṛita era in the pre-Gupta age.[3]

1. Keith, A.B., *History of the Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 266 ff.
2. Cf. Sircar, D.C., *op.cit.*, p. 108; also H.C. Raychaudhuri in the *Vikrama Volume*, pp. 483 ff.
3. For detailed discussion on this point cf. Sircar, D.C., *Indian Epigraphy*. pp. 251-258; *Ancient Malwa*, pp. 162-166; *Vikrama Volume*, pp. 1-19; 57-69, 115-136, 289-302, 557-586; Kielhorn, *IA*, Vols. XIX, XX; Cunningham, *JRAS*, 1913, p. 627; Marshall, *JRAS*, 1914, p. 973; 191- p. 191.

The arguments advanced against the historicity of Vikramāditya are weighty enough. But despite them it may be conceded that the element of Śaka-Mālava struggle in the Vikramāditya legend is based on some actual occurrence. It is quite possible that such an event was the nucleus round which the details of the later Vikramāditya tradition were woven. This theoretical possibility of Śaka-Mālava struggle in the middle of the first century B.C. has found some substance in the recent discoveries of some copper coins from Ujjain and Vidiśā,[1] though here it needs to be re-emphasised that they in no way prove the historicity of Vikramāditya. These copper coins bear striking similarity to the local coinage of Ujjain. Some of the names of their issuers written in the early Brāhmī script are Hamugama, Valāka, Mahu, Sauma, Dāsa, Hauma, etc. As pointed out by K.D. Bajpai, looking to the names of Indian kings occurring on some other coins of Malwa, e.g. Dharmapāla, Indragupta, Śivagupta and Vishākhadeva, etc., it is doubtful if these names can represent local Indian rulers.[2] On the other hand, a comparison of the names of these rulers with those of the Śaka chiefs already known to us from inscriptions and coins such as Hagāmasha, Hagāna, Chaṭaka, Hayuara, Hana, Aduthama, Pharagula, Ayama, Khalamasa, Maṇigula Abuhola, etc., leave little scope for doubt that the rulers of the coins under discussion were foreigners, most likely of Scythian origin.[3] And if this is so, it must be admitted that even before the establishment of the Kshaharata kingdom in western India in the middle of the first century A.D., a branch of the Śakas had penetrated at least western Malwa, for on palaeographical grounds these coins are assigned to the third or early second century B.C. by Altekar[4] and to '100 B.C., in any case to a period not later than 50 B.C.' by Bajpai.[5] In our opinion the later view is more likely to be correct. In

1. K.D. Bajpai's article in the *Seminar Papers of the Tribal Coins of Northern India*, pp. 4-6; *JNSI*, Vol. XXVIII, pp. 46-50.
2. *JNSI*, XXVIII, p. 47.
3. *Loc. cit.*
4. Quoted by Bajpai, *op.cit.*, p. 47.
5. *Loc. cit.*

the light of this evidence it may be conjectured that in the first century B.C. the Mālavas of Rajasthan clashed with the Śakas of Ujjayanī and in the later epochs, when Ujjayanī became the seat of the Mālavas themselves, it was mistakenly believed that the Mālavas were occupying that city even in the first century B.C.

Śaka-Mālava Struggle : The Second Phase

The Śakas who curbed the growing power of the Mālavas and conquered large parts of Rajasthan were the Western Kshatrapas of the Kshaharata dynasty. The first Śaka chief of this family who appears to have conquered some area of western and southern Rajasthan was Bhūmaka, the first known member of the Kshaharata dynasty. His coins have been discovered, apart from other places, in the Ajmer region of Rajasthan.[1] According to D.C. Sircar, the use of the Kharoshṭhī alongwith the Brāhmī script on his coin-legend, also points to the fact that his kingdom comprised not only Brāhmī using areas but also western Rajputana and Sindh where Kharoshṭhī appears to have been in use,[2] though some scholars are inclined to associate the use of this script with the northern origin of Kshaharātas.[3]

For the reign of Nahapāna, the successor of Bhūmaka, we have more detailed evidence for the Śaka penetration in Rajasthan and the defeat of Mālavas at their hands. The coins of Nahapāna have been discovered in Ajmer in the north to Nasik in the south,[4] indicating that large parts of Rajasthan covering Ajmer and the region south of it were included in the Śaka dominion. Further, in connection with the benefactions of Ushavadāta (Sanskrit Ṛishabhadatta), the son of Dīnīka and the son-in-law of Nahapāna. the Kshaharāta inscriptions refer to, among other sacred places, Pushkara near

1. *AIU*, p., 197.
2. *Loc. cit.*
3. Quoted in *AIU*, p. 197.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 180.

Ajmer also.[1] And, finally, one of the Nasik Cave Inscriptions of Nahapāna[2] states that at the command of his 'Bhaṭṭāraka', Ṛishabhadatta went to relieve the chief of the Uttamabhadra tribe who was besieged by the Malayas, i.e. Mālavas.[3] "By the orders of my lord" he records, "I went in the rainy season to relieve the Uttamabhadras who were besieged by the Mālavas; and those Mālavas fled even on hearing my battle-cry. They were made prisoners of the Uttamabhadra Kshatriyas".[4] Dasharatha Sharma translates the word *parigraha* as 'subordinate' and not as 'prisoner'.[5] But *parigraha* also means 'captive'[6] and this meaning yields a better sense here. For it is difficult to believe that a tribe as powerful as the Mālavas could be made subordinate to the almost unknown Uttamabhadras. Be what it may, after inflicting a crushing defeat on the Mālavas Ṛishabhadatta is said to have gone to the Pushkara lake for ceremonial consecration.[7] It is obvious, therefore, that the Ajmer region in Rajasthan, along with the

1. ततोस्मि गतो पोक्षरानि तत्र च मया अभिसेको कृतो··· Nasik Cave Ins., Sircar, *SI*, p. 169. Situated 11 kms to the west of Ajmer, Pushkara is one of the most sacred places of the Hindus in India. It finds mention in the *Rāmāyaṇa, the Mahābhārata*, the *Vāmana Purāṇa* and the inscriptions from second century B.C. onwards (*EI*, II, pp. 394, 396, 397 and 398). For details cf. Jain, K.C., *Ancient Cities and Towns of Rajasthan*, pp. 100-105.
2. Sircar, *op.cit.*, pp. 167 ff.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 169.
4. भटारका-अजातिया च गतोस्मि वर्षा-
   रतुं मालयेहि हिरुधं उत्तमभाद्रं मोचयितुं ।
   ते च मालया प्रनादेनेव अपयाता
   उत्तमभद्रकानं च क्षत्रियानं सर्वे परिग्रहा कृता ॥
   —Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 169.
5. Sharma, D., *Journal of the Oriental Institute*, Baroda, Vol. X, No. 2, Dec. 1960, p. 182.
6. Williams, M., *A Sanskrit English Dictionary*, Delhi 1964, p. 593; Apte, V.S., *The Students Sanskrit English Dictionary*, Delhi, 1965, p. 319.
7. Sircar, *op.cit.*, p. 169.

Nahapāna, as the ruler of Ariake (i.e. Aparānta=Northern Konkan) with one of its capitals at Minnagara (situated near Barygaza).[1] Secondly, according to the *Geography* of Ptolemy (written about A.D. 140 with materials gathered a few years earlier)[2] Tiastenes (a Greek corruption of the name Chashṭana), was ruling over *Ozene*, i.e. Ujjayanī[3] while *Siro Polemainos*, identified with Siri Pulumāvi, was the ruler of Baithana, i.e. *Paithan* (Pratishṭhāna).[4] On the other hand, the view of Rapson would place Pulumāvi in Akarāvanti (which included the city of Ujjayanī) in the year 149 A.D. In view of these difficulties Cunningham[5] and Nilakanta Sastri[6] refer the dates of Nahapāna to the Vikrama era. But their suggestion can hardly be accepted as Nahapāna knew gold coins[7] which were introduced for the first time in India by Wima Kadphises.[8] Moreover, Gautamīputra, the contemporary of Nahapāna cannot be placed in so early a period. We are, therefore, inclined to accept the suggestions of Banerjee, Gopalachari[9] etc. that the inscriptions of Nahapāna are dated in his own regnal years. Therefore the reign of Nahapāna may be placed between c. 60 A.D. and 110 A.D. while Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi, who ruled for at least 24 years, should be assigned to the period from c. 90 A.D. to 115 A.D. In that case Pulumāvi the successor of Gautamīputra, who ruled for at least 26 years (as is evident from his Karle Cave Inscription),[10] must have ruled from c. 115 A.D. to 145 A.D. This chronological scheme reconciles all the known facts of history, viz.

1. Gopalachari, K., *Early History of the Andhra country*, p. 50; Altekar, A.S., *PIHC.*, XIII, pp. 35 ff.
2. *AIU.*, p. 183.
3. *Loc. cit.*
4. *Comp. Hist. India*, II, p.316.
5. *Ibid.*, 309 fn. 1.
6. *Ibid*, p. 315 fn. 1.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 232-233.
8. *Loc. cit.*
9. *Loc. cit.*
10. Sircar, *SI*, pp. 210-11.

the reference to Nahapāna by the author of the *Pariplus* in the latter half of the first century A.D., the fact that Nahapāna was aware of the gold coins, the rule of Pulumāvi over Ujjayanī till 140 A.D. and the Jaina tradition that Nahapāna ruled for 40 to 42 years, and also proves that Rajasthan was invaded by the Kshaharāta Śakas sometime towards the close of the first century A.D. or towards the beginning of the second century A.D.

This brings us to our next problem viz. the nature of Kshaharāta-Kushāṇa relationship. This problem is intimately connected with the question of the date of Kanishka I who is now generally regarded as the founder of the Śaka era of 78 A.D. We have no intention to review this problem as it lies beyond the scope of our present inquiry. However, it may be noted that in the International Conference on the date of Kanishka held at London in April 1960 most of the scholars supported dates ranging from 78 A. D. to 144 A.D.[1] Of these 78 A.D. is borne out by the evidence of Indian tradition and epigraphy. We have, therefore, accepted it, as a working hypothesis. It means that Kanishka ruled from 78 A.D. to at least 101 A.D.[2] He was, thus, according to the Kshaharāta chronology accepted above, a contemporary of Nahapāna. Now the question arises whether Nahapāna accepted the overlordship of Kanishka I ? If it was so, it would mean that the Kushāṇas exercised at least indirect control over those regions of Rajasthan which were included in the kingdom of the Kshaharāta Kshatrapas. Most of the scholars including Baldev Kumar,[3] the recent-most historian on the early Kushāṇa period, subscribe to this view. It must, however, be admitted that the evidence on this point is not conclusive.[4] As regards

1. Basham, A.L., (ed.) *Papers on the Date of Kanishka*, Leiden, 1968.
2. *AIU.*, p. 144.
3. Kumar. B. *The Early Kushāṇas, Delhi*, 1973, p. 79, 107.
4. Nahapāna's status was higher (cf. the title of *rāna* of his coins) than that of Kanishka's other Kshatrapas (*Comp. Hist. Ind.*, II, p. 241.)

the numismatic evidence, it has been rightly pointed out by J.N. Banerjee[1] that there is absolutely nothing in the Kshaharāta coins which may suggest their subordination to the Kushāṇas. On the other hand, the obverse device of Bhūmakas' coins, viz. an arrow, discus and thunder-bolt, which also invariably figures on all the known silver and copper coins of Nahapāna, reminds one of the 'discus, bow and arrow' reverse of some copper coins jointly issued by Spalirises and Azes II.[2] Therefore, it is quite possible that Bhūmaka and Nahapāna ruled over Western India as the Kshatrapas of the Pahlavas.[3] Secondly, if the dates of Nahapāna accepted above are correct, it would follow that Nahapāna did not use the era of Kanishka though he was a contemporary of the great Kushāṇa emperor. This fact may be regarded as an indication of his independence from the Kushāṇa domination. As regards the epigraphic evidence, there is certainly a reference in a Nasik inscription to the 'Bhaṭṭāraka' who was the overlord of Ushavadāta, the son-in-law of Nahapāna.[4] It was at the command of 'the Bhaṭṭāraka' that Ushavadāta went to invade the Mālava tribe. It is quite likely that here may be a reference to the Kushāṇa overlord of the Kshaharātas. But it is equally possible that in this document the title 'Bhaṭṭāraka' stands for Nahapāna himself who was obviously the immediate master of Ushavadāta. The fact that the Kshaharātas knew gold coins[5] does not prove anything because Kushāṇa gold coins must have been known to them whether they were subject to the Kushāṇa authority or not. In one of the Nasik cave inscriptions of Nahapāna there is another controversial word *Kushāṇa mūla*[6]

1. *Comp. Hist. Ind.*, II, p. 274.
2. *Ibid.*, pp. 203 and 274.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 274.
4. Sircar, *SI*, pp. 167-169.
5. Cf. Sircar, *SI*, p. 165 fn. 5.
6. दत चानेन अक्षयनिधिकाहापण-सहस्रानि त्रीणि
   ३००० संघस चातुदिसस ये इयस्मि लेणे वसांतानं
   भविसंति बिदरिक कुशाणमूले च ।

   —*Ibid.*, p. 165.

which has been taken by Bhandarkar as a coin designation named after the Kushāṇas.[1] He suggests that it stood for the silver coin of Nahapāna. But the suggestion is hardly tenable. The relevant passage has been translated by others as 'expenses of outside life.' According to D.C. Sircar, it is also possible that here the word *Kushāṇa* stands for *Kṛiśānna*=minor food, probably including minor necessities.[2] In any case this passage is also not sufficient to prove the Kushāṇa hegemony over the Kshaharātas.

Thus the available evidence does not prove that the Kshaharātas were subordinate to the Kushāṇas. On the other hand, it must be admitted that the alternative that the Kshaharātas were wholly independent of Kushāṇa hold is also not free from difficulties. It was the age when the Kushāṇas carried their victorious arms upto Bihar in the east, Khurasan in the west and Khotan in the north.[3] Therefore, it should be regarded as highly unlikely that they left the fair provinces of Western India to their own fate and did not bring them within the sphere of their influence. It is, however, probable that Kanishka I died before he could make any attempts in this direction. In that case one may assume that these provinces were brought under Kushāṇa suzerainty during the next generation. But by that time Kshaharāta family had become extinct largely owing to the efforts of Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi, the Sātavāhana emperor.

The Uttamabhadras who are mentioned in the Nasik Cave Inscription[4] of Nahapāna are not definitely known from any other source. According to Dasharatha Sharma, they may be identified with the Bhadanakas who spoke Apabhraṁśa

1. Bhandarkar, D R, *Carmichael Lectures on Ancient Indian Numismatics*, Calcutta, 1921, pp. 199-200.
2. Sircar, *op. cit.*, p 160 fn. 3. Another Nasik record of Nahapāna refers to *Mukhāhāra* or *Mukhyāhāra* (*ibid.*, p. 169).
3. Vide, *AIU*, pp. 141-143; *Comp. Hist. Ind.* II, pp. 237-38; Kumar, B., *The Early Kushāṇas*, pp. 77-84, 109; Chattopadhyaya, S., *EHNI.*, pp. 81-85.
4. Sircar, *SI*, p. 162.

and are grouped with the Ṭakkas, inhabitants of Maru-land in Rājaśekhara's *Kāvyamīmāṁsā*.[1] He also believed that they gave their name to the town called Bhadrā situated in the north-east corner of Rajasthan. He has further identified them with the Madras of the Panjab. According to the Pāṇini's *Ashṭādhyāyī* the words Bhadra and Madra are synonyms.[2] The *Kāśikā* also mentions a people called the Madrakaras. According to V.S. Agrawala, they should be regarded as identical with Bhadrakaras or the Bhadra warriors settled in the Bhadrā region of Rajasthan.[3] It should be noted that the words *kāra* and *anīka* stand for the same thing, i.e. an army. Therefore, the Bhadrakaras could also be called Bhadrānīkas which later on got corrupted into Bhadranaka or Bhādānaka.[4] The Madras were divided into three sections, the northern, the eastern and the southern. It appears that a branch of the northern Madras or the Uttar Madras tracked down into Rajasthan and settled in Bhadrā region and even further to the fertile tracts of Ajmer and Pushkara. Dasharatha Sharma suggests that this branch is mentioned as Uttamabhadras in the above mentioned Nasik Cave Inscription. They could have been afraid of the expansion of the Mālavas, and, therefore, they sought the protection of the Śakas who were hostile to the Mālavas.[5] However, their policy did not succeed, for, as discussed above, their allies, the Kshaharātas were soon overthrown by the Sātavāhanas.

Śaka-Mālava struggle : the third phase

So far as Rajasthan is concerned the extinction of the Kshaharātas did not lead to the extermination of Śaka rule.

1. *Journal of the Oriental Institute*, Baroda, Vol. X, No. 2, Dec. 1960, pp. 182-83; also *RTA*., I, pp. 20.
2. *Ashtādhyāyī*, 2.3.73; 5.4.67 quoted by V.S. Agrawal, *Pāṇini Kālīna Bhāratvarsha*, pp. 72-73; *Rajasthan Bhāratī*, III, 3-4, p. 6.
3. Agrawal, V.S., *Loc. cit*.
4. *JOI*, *op. cit*., p. 183.
5. For detailed analysis of their geographical location Vide, D. (ed.), *RTA*, I, pp. 20-24 (Appendix 'A' on the Bhādānakas).

The Mālavas, Yaudheyas and other tribes of this region had to face the invasion of the Kārdamakas, another Scythian family, which established its authority over large tracts of Rajasthan under the leadership of Chashṭana. Till a few years ago only four inscriptions of Chashṭana of the Śaka year 52, discovered from Andhau in the Kachchha district of Gujarat, were known[1] They revealed that in that year Chashtana, the son of Ysamotika was ruling with the title *rājño* (rājan) with his grandson Rudradāman I, the son of Jayadāman, as his joint ruler.[2] As these documents do not give any royal title to Jayadāman, it is assumed that he did not rule and predeceased his father.[3] Be what it may, on the authority of these inscriptions it was generally conjectured that Chashṭana succeeded Nahapāna as the viceroy of the Kushāṇa emperor in their Western provinces sometime after the extermination of the Kshaharātas (who were, according to this theory, subordinates of the Kushāṇas) and was sent with the instructions to reconquer the lost provinces of the empire.[4] But now another inscription of Ysamotika's son from Andhau dated in the year 11, obviously of the Śaka era, has been discovered.[5] It proves that a son of Ysamotika, probably Chashṭana was already ruling in the Kachchha region in 89 A.D. Chashṭana was certainly a viceroy of the Kushāṇas. He not only adopted the subordinate title Mahākshatrapa on his coins but he as well as his successors also used the imperial Kushāṇa era, i.e the Śaka era. Further his image has been found in the Kushāṇa Devakula at Mata, 9 miles from Mathura (U.P.) which proves that he was in some way related to the imperial family.[6] The combined import of these facts is that he ruled in western

1. Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 173-175.
2. राज्ञो चाष्ट्नस य्सामोतिक-पुत्रस राज्ञो रुद्रदामस
   जयदाम-पुत्रस
   —*Ibid.*, p. 174.
3. *AIU*, p. 183.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 182.
5. *JAIH.*, II, pp. 104-111.
6. J.M. Rosenfield, in *Papers on the Date of Kanishka*, ed. by A L. Basham, pp. 260-266; also, *Itihāsa Samīkshā*, year 2, pt. II, p. 178.

India as a viceroy of the Kushāṇa emperors. It appears that when the Kshaharātas were overthrown by the Sātavāhanas in the early years of the second century, the Kushāṇa emperors decided to intervene in the politics of Malwa and Rajasthan and entrusted the task of establishing Kushāṇa hegemony in these regions to Chashṭana, their viceroy in Kachchha. It is quite possible that Chashṭana invaded Malwa and Rajasthan from Kachchha while the imperial army operated from the north. In any case the Kārdamaka adventure was eminently successful and they imposed their hold over several provinces including the whole of Malwa, Marudeśa and some other regions of Rajasthan.

The main part in this victorious compaign was played probably by Rudradāman I who succeeded Chashṭana as Mahākshtrapa some time after 130 A.D. (the date of the later Andhau records[1] when he was only a joint-ruler with Chashṭana) and before 150 A.D. (the date of his Junagarh record[2] when he was a Mahākshatrapa). It is significant that in this epigraph Rudradāman claims to have conquered Malwa, Gujarat and Kathiawar, Sindhu-Sauvīra, Western Vindhyas and the Aravalli range (Nishāda) and, Maru (the Marwar region.[3] It appears that by the year 150 A.D., i.e. during the reign of the successors of Kanishka I, who were possibly not so powerful, Rudradāman I refused to continue to acknowledge Kushāṇa suzerainty and became independent,[4] though, like Pushyamitra Śuṅga, he and his successors continued to adopt the title Mahākshatrapa on their coins and in inscriptions.[5] Rudradāman I's rule over almost whole of Rajasthan is proved

1. Sircar, *SI*, pp. 173-175.
2. *Ibid.*, pp. 175-180.
3. पूर्व्वापराकरावन्त्यनूपनीवृदानर्त्त-सुराष्ट्र-श्वभ्र-
मरु-कच्छ-सिन्धु-सौवीर-कुकुरापरांत-निषादादीनां :
Ibid., p. 178 and fn. 4.
4. *AIU*, p. 185.
5. Sircar, *SI*., pp. 175 ff and pp. 180-181; *Comp. Hist. Ind.* II, pp. 282-283.

by the fact of his decisive victory over the Yaudheyas[1] who were then occupying northern parts of Rajasthan and the adjoining regions of Panjab and Harayana. The western part of Rajputana, i.e., the region of the Thar desert or the Marudeśa, was also certainly included in his dominion because along with Sindhu and Sauvīra, i.e. western part of the lower Sindhu Valley and eastern part of the lower Sindhu Valley,[2] which lay to the west of Rajasthan, has been included in the list of the regions conquered by him. His reference to Yaudheyas as a tribe which was known for its valour (*vīraśabda-jāta*)[3] shows that he had to make great efforts for making this martial tribe, the 'heroes among all Kshatriyas', submissive to him.

Rudradāman I not only imposed his suzerainty over the Yaudheyas but appears to have carried his victorious arms upto Sialkot (in the present Pakistani part of the former Panjab state). This fact is known from a Buddhist legend contained in the *Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā*, also known as *Kalpanālaṅkritikā*, of Kumāralāta composed about 150 A.D.[4] It is a collection of parables, mostly Buddhistic in character. Fragments of its manuscript were discovered at Turfan in Central Asia.[5] In 405 A.D. it was translated into Chinese by Kumārajīva who gave it the name of *Sūtrālaṅkāra* and through inadvertence attributed it to Aśvaghosha.[6] The poet Kumāralāta who, flourished towards the middle of the second century A.D., was a native of Taxila. He, therefore, must have been the contemporary of the immediate successors of Kanishka I and

1. सर्वक्षत्राविष्कृत-वीर-शब्द-जातोत्सेकाविधेयानां यौधेयानां प्रसह्योत्सादकेन......

Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 178, and fn. 4.

2. *AIU.*, pp. 184-185.
3. Sircar, *SI*, p. 178.
4. Chatterjee, C.D., *JAIH*, Vol. I, pt 1-2, 1967-68, pp. 115-116.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 115.
6. *Loc. cit.* cf. Wilhalm, F., In *Papers on the Date of Kanishka* (ed. by A.L. Basham), pp. 337-44.

Rudradāman I.[1] Viewed against this background his evidence regarding some political events of his period cannot be lightly brushed aside. Most pertinent in this connection is his reference to Kanishka I as an earlier king (which incidently proves that Kanishka I must be placed appreciably before the middle of the second century A.D.) and his reference to the northern expedition of Rudradāman (i.e. Mahākshatrapa Rudradāman I) as far as Sagal.[2] This important event of the reign of Rudradāman I might have taken place when he had gone to invade the Yaudheyas who were residing in northern Rajasthan and southern Panjab. This fact also proves that Rudradāman I must have been in control of the whole of Rajasthan, otherwise he could not have dared to advance from Ujjain as far north as Sialkot. Incidentally, it also suggests that Rudradāman I flourished later than Kanishka I, for he could have hardly invaded the heartland of the Kushāṇa empire during the reign of this great emperor himself.

The Śaka domination over Rajasthan continued for about three quarters of a century more, i.e. till the end of the first quarter of the third century A.D. There is no positive evidence to help us in the reconstruction of the history of this period. But the continuation of Śaka rule ever Rajasthan is indicated by the discovery of the coins of the successors of Rudradāman I from this region. Two coins of Atridāman, who may be identified with Bhartridāman, and Asadāman (identical with Yaśodāman) were found at Nagari by Carlleyle.[3] A big hoard containing 2393 Śaka coins was found at Saravaniya in the former Banswara State. This important hoard yielded coins of many Śaka rulers of post-Rudradāman period.[4] How-

1. *JAIH*, I, 1-2, pp. 115-116; cf. *Itihāsa Samīkshā*, 2, II, 1972, pp. 173-180; *JAIH*, II, 1-2, 1968-69, pp. 129-156; cf. also Basham, A.L., *op. cit.*, pp. 137-44 and other relevant papers.
2. *JAIH*, I, 1-2, pp. 115-116.
3. Sharma, D., *RTA.*, I, p. 55.
4. E.g., Rudrasiṁha I, Rudrasena, Saṅghadāman, Dāmasena, Dāmajadaśrī II, Yaśodāman, Vīradāman, Vijayasena, Dāmajadaśrī III, Yaśodāman II, and Rudrasiṁha III; cf. *Rajputana Museum Ajmer, Annual Report*, 1913, pp. 3-8; Ojha, G.H., *History of Banswara State*, 1st ed., Ajmer, 1937, pp. 26-32; also *Marubhāratī*; VIII, pt. 4, p. 70; *The Researcher*, Vols. XII-XIII, 1972-73.

ever, owing to their joint rule system, wars of succession and several other factors the Śaka power gradually became weaker.[1] Meanwhile the power of the Kushāṇas also, who ruled over an extensive empire in north India till the last decades of second century A.D. under the leadership of the house of Kanishka, declined after the region of Vāsudeva I (A.D. 145-175).[2] Whether they tried and succeeded in penetrating Rajasthan at the expense of the Śakas in the post-Rudradāman period is not definitely known. It may, however, be noted that they ruled over the Indus basin at least from the time of Wima Kadphises (who has in the Chinese Annals been given the credit of being the first Kushāṇa king who conquered Tien-tchou).[3] Their hold over that region continued during the reign of Kanishka I (vide his Sui-Vihar Inscription of year 11=88 A.D.)[4] and his successors upto Vāsudeva I (as is proved by the discovery of a large hoard of Kushāṇa coins numbering 1438 from Mohenjo-Daro in which the issues of Vāsudeva I are the latest).[5] In Rajasthan itself coins of Wima Kadphises were discovered in Suratgarh and Hanumangarh by A. Stein and the isolated findings of the coins of other Kushāṇa rulers have been reported from Rangmahal, Sambhar, etc.[6] Of these only the Sui-Vihar epigraph may be regarded as the positive proof of the Kushāṇa hold over the Bahawalpur area of northern Rajasthan. But whether the successors of Kanishka I continued to hold their sway over it is rather difficult to determine with the meagre numismatic evidence at our disposal. Probably they could not. By and large we are not in a position to give the Kushāṇas the credit of ruling over Rajasthan after the conquests of Rudradāman I, who, as we have seen, invaded Sialkot itself which was situated in the heartland of the Kushāṇa empire.

1. *NHIP.*, p. 47 ff.
2. *AIU.*, p 151.
3. *AIU.*, p. 139; Comp. Hist. Ind. II, pp. 230-33; *The Early Kushāṇas*, pp. 41-43.
4. Sircar, *SI.*, pp. 139-40.
5. Mukherjee, B.N., in *Papers on the Date of Kanishka* (ed. by A.L. Basham), pp. 200-205; also cf. Marshall, J., (ed.), *Mohenjo-Daro and the Indus Civilization*, Vol. I, pp. 127-128, fn 1.
6. Sharma, D., *RTA*, I, pp. 56.

were pressed hard by the Nāgas in the east[1] and the Iranians in the West.[2]

When the Yaudheyas were fighting for their freedom, the Mālavas were not sitting on the fence. They also unfurled the banner of independence against their Śaka overlords and became free, perhaps in the year 226 A.D., when their leader Śrī Soma or Nandisoma performed *Ekashashṭhirātra* sacrifice probably to proclaim the independence of the Mālava republic. This fact is evidenced by the Nāndsā Yūpa Inscription of the Kṛita Saṁvat 282 (=226 A.D.).[3] This epigraph records that freedom and prosperity had returned by that year to the country of the Mālavas as a result of the brilliant achievements of their leader. Thus the chapter of the prolonged struggle of the republican tribes of Rajasthan against Scythian domination finally came to a close.

Rajasthan on the Eve of the Rise of the Guptas :
Transition to Monarchism

The history of the tribes of Rajasthan from about 226 A. D., the date of the Nāndsā record of Śrī Soma or Nandi Soma,[4] to the middle of the fourth century A.D., when the Guptas rose to power and brought them within the sphere of their influence, is not known in detail. However, with the help of the scanty information at our disposal, which is mainly numismatic and epigraphic, we can endevour to reconstruct the main outline of their history in this period.

Most of the tribes of Rajasthan enjoyed almost complete freedom in the century preceding the rise of the Guptas. Let us first take up the case of the Yaudheyas. Their victory over the imperial Kushāṇas had increased their prestige. They were already famous as a brave people since the days of Pāṇini,[5] and even Rudradāman I, their redoubtable enemy, had to

1. *NHIP.*, p. 14.
2. *Ibid.*, pp. 18-19.
3. *EI*, XXVII, pp. 252-267.
4. *EI*, XXVII, pp. 252-269.
5. *Supra*, Ch. 1.

praise their heroism though he succeeded in obtaining a smashing victory over them.[1] After their glorious success against foreigners they rightly celebrated their victory by issuing a new currency which bears a resemblance to the Kushāṇa coinage which it replaced in weight and general fabric.[2] It was, however, more Indian in nature, as in it the foreign Greek and Kharoshṭhī scripts were replaced by Brāhmī, and Kārttikeya, the *senāpati* of gods, was given a place of honour.[3] Kārttikeya or Mahāsena has been regarded as the tutelary deity of the Yaudheyas in the Mahābhārata also.

The south-eastern neighbours of the Yaudheyas were the Ārjunāyanas who were occupying the Delhi-Agra-Jaipur region. They had obviously also been subject to the Kushāṇa authority and had rebelled against it when the Yaudheyas and other tribes started their war of liberation. Unfortunately, they did not issue any independent coinage in the post-Kushāṇa period, though their existence as a separate republican state is proved beyond doubt by the Prayāga *praśasti* of Samudragupta, in which they figure in the list of the tributaries of Gupta emperor.[4] The total absence of their coinage in this period is rather intriguing. According to Altekar, it is quite likely that in this period they formed a kind of loose confederation with the Yaudheyas which obviated the necessity of a separate coinage for them.[5] According to tradition, the Yaudheyas and the Ārjunāyanas were the descendants of the Pāṇḍava brothers Yudhishṭhira and Arjuna. This belief could have helped them in coalescing with each other.[6] The numismatic evidence for this hypothesis is provided by the words

1. Sircar, *SI*, p. 178.
2. *NHIP*, p. 30.
3. *Loc. cit.*
4. मालवार्जुनायन-यौधेय माद्रकाभीर-प्रार्जुन-सनका-
नीक काक-खरपरिकादिभिश्च सर्व्व-कर-
दानाज्ञाकरण-प्रणामागमन-परितोषित-प्रचण्ड-शासनस्य
Sircar, *SI*, pp. 265-66.
5. *NHIP*, p. 32.
6. *Loc. cit.*

dvi and tri found on the Yaudheya coins after the legend *Yaudheyagaṇasya jayaḥ*. It is quite likely that these terms refer to the Ārjunāyanas and other tribes, who, according to Altekar, became members of the Yaudheya Confederation.[1]

Now the Malavas emerged as the most important and the strongest republican tribe of Rajasthan of the post-Kushāṇa period. During the course of their struggle against the Kushāṇas the Mālavas had probably developed strong monarchical tendencies, for in the Nāndsā Yūpa inscription their leader Śri Soma or Nandi Soma is described as supporting the ancestral yoke of public administration.[2] It is true that neither he nor his father or grandfather is given any royal or military titles like *Mahārāja* or *Senāpati*, but interestingly enough he claims that his family was as respectable as that of the royal family of the Ikshvākus.[3] He and his ancestors obviously led the state armies in times of war and organised the civil administration in times of peace. The monarchical tendency was even stronger among the Yaudheyas, for the head of the Yaudheya state was permitted the regal title of *Mahārāja* (though his post was still elective, as is evident from their Bijayagadh Stone Inscription.[4] and he was not permitted to put his name on the state currency). On the Yaudheya coin the legend is always *Yaudheyagaṇasya jayaḥ*. Thus we find that among the

1. Probably Kuṇindas were one of the members of this oonfederation also. They were occupying the regions between the upper courses of the Sutlej and the Beas. Like the Yaudheyas they were an independent republic before the middle of the first century A.D. They are not included in the list of the tribes which accepted the overlordship of Samudragupta. It may, therefore, he assumed that by the middle of the fourth century they had completely merged with the Yaudheyas of the Punjab and Rajasthan.

2. पितृपैतामहीन्धुरम्—

EI, XXVII, pp. 252 ff.

3. इक्ष्वाकुप्रथितराजर्षिवंशे मालववंशे प्रसूतस्य......

—*Ibid.*

4. यौधेयगणपुरस्कृतस्य महाराजमहासेनापतेः......

—Sircar, *SI*, p. 252.

Mālavas and other tribes by this time monarchical tendencies had developed, though, by and large, they were still adhering to their republican traditions.

It is genarally assumed that from 226 A.D., the date of the Nāndsā Yūpa inscription, the Mālavas enjoyed complete independence till their subjugation by Samudragupta sometime in the middle of the fourth century A.D. It is, however, just possible that in the third century A.D. they had to accept the suzerainty of the Nāgas of Padmāvatī (Padma Pawaya near Narwar in the Shivpuri district of M.P.),[1] though we admit that the evidence on this point is not very conclusive: The Bhāraśiva Nāgas were the eastern neighbours of the Mālavas. Therefore, when the city of Padmāvatī produced a Nāga dynasty which performed as many as ten Aśvamedhas,[2] the Mālavas were bound to feel pressure of the new power. Viewed against this background it becomes very significant that the name Kārkoṭanagara was often applied to the Mālava capital. It is indicative of the possibility that for sometime it had become intimately associated with the Kārboṭas or the Nāgas.[3] Secondly, it may also be noted that Nāga influence is quite manifest on some of the later Mālava coins.[4] The fact that the various place names such as Nagarī, Nāgdā (and his variations like Nāgahṛida, Nāgadraha, Nāgadṛhapur), Nāgaur (and its variations Ahipura, Nāgapur), Nāgapalli, Takshakagaḍha, etc.,[5] are derived from the name Nāga and that Nāga worship is quite prevalent in various parts of Rajasthan, may or may not be connected with the supposed Nāga domination It is thus just a possibility that sometime in the third fourth century A.D., i.e. after the end of the Kushāṇa

1. Cf. Sircar, D.C., *Ancient Malwa and the Vikramāditya Tradition*, p. 6.
2. पराक्रमाधिगतभागीरथ्यमलजलमूर्द्धाभिषिक्तानान्दशाश्वमेधावभृयस्ना-तानाम्भारशिवानाम्महाराजश्रि(श्री) भवनागदौहित्रस्य —Mirashi, V.V., *Vākāṭaka Rājavaṁśa kā Itihāsa tathā Abhilekha*, p. 149.
3. Goyal, S.R., *PRHC*, Vol. VI, 1973, p. 16.
4. Smith, V.A., *Catalogue of Coins*, pp. 162 ff.
5. For references and description of these places see Jain, K.C., *Ancient Cities and Towns of Rajasthan*.

domination and before the rise of the Guptas, the Bhāraśiva Nāgas of Padmāvatī brought the Mālavas of Rajasthan under their hegemony.

However, the Nāga domination over the Mālavas, if a historical fact, must have been a very short-lived affair. Actually by and large it was the age of the Mālava glory ; the period when the Mālavas made their influence felt over very large tracts of Rajasthan and even in the region south of it. It was the period of their expansion. But it was their ambition, for expansion which made their inherent weakness explicit. It is quite obvious that the republican form of government is never suited for imperialistic expansion. There are very few cases in ancient history of mankind where a republican state succeeded in creating an empire, and all such cases were undoubtedly the result of highly exceptional circumstances which could not be early repeated.[1] The Lichchhavis failed against Ajātaśatru because of this inherent weakness in their political set up. They could at the most aspire to repulse an invasion whenever it took place ; they could not put an end to the recurrence of invasions by imposing their own authority over the invader. The very nature of their political set up precluded this possibility. On the other hand, once their resistance was broken they could easily be amalgamated by the victor in his ever increasing empire. That is what happened with them. Similar was the fate which awaited the Mālavas of Rajasthan. As a republican tribe they could not hope to expand and yet maintain their unity. In other words, any imperialistic venture by them was out of question. Therefore, when they tried to colonise other parts of Rajasthan and the region south of it, the disintegration of their tribal unity could not be avoided.

We have reasons to believe that the gradual expansion of the Mālava tribe did result in the disintegration of their republic, leading to the emergence of several independent, or semi-independent entities which were ruled over by the people of Mālava stock. The most important of such Mālava state

1. Cf. *PRHC*, VI, 1973, p. 16.

was the parent state itself situated in the Jaipur-Ajmer-Mewar region since the Śuṅga period. As we have seen it achieved its independence from the foreign yoke under the leadership of Śrī Soma or Nandi Soma in 226 A.D.[1] He claims that he was born in the Mālava family and belonged to the clan of Sogins; and that his family was as famous as the royal family of the Ikshvākus.[2] Another inscription[3] of the Sogins discovered not very far from the site of the Nāndsā Yūpa reveals the name of a certain Mahāsenāpati Bhaṭṭisoma who also belonged to the clan of the Sogins.[4] As this epigraph is undated, Bhaṭṭisoma cannot be given a precise date. But from the palaeography of his record it appears that he was a near contemporary of Nandi Soma and, as his name suggests, was most likely a member of the same family. A.S. Altekar even suggests the possibility of his being identical with Nandi Soma himself.[5] We, however, do not think that such was the case, for *soma* ending names were quite popular among the Sogins and therefore, Bhaṭṭisoma could very well have been a separate individual. From his title *Mahāsenāpati* it appears that he was probably a powerful member of the clan which controlled the military and political affairs of the Mālava state.

Another important branch of the Mālava tribe was the Maukharis. Till now the Maukharis have been looked upon as quite different and distinct from the Mālavas, but now it has been very convincingly shown[6] that the Maukharis known

1. *EI*, XXVII, pp. 252 ff.
2. इक्ष्वाकुप्रथितराजर्षिवंशे मालववंशे प्रसूतस्य
   जयनर्तनपु (प्र) मि (भा) ग्र वर्द्धन पौत्रस्य
   जयसोमपुत्रस्य सोगिने (त:) श्री सोम...
   —*Ibid.*
3. *Ibid.*, pp. 266-67.
4. महासेनापतिस्य (पतेः) भट्टिसोमस्य
   सोगिस्य (सोगेः) म-
   —*Ibid.*, p. 266 f.
5. *EI*, XXVII, p. 267.
6. Goyal, S.R., *PRHC*, VI, 1973, 16-17.

from the Badvā Yūpa Inscription of Kṛita (Mālava) era 295 (239 A.D.)[1] as well as the later imperial Maukharīs of Kanauj belonged to the Mālava stock. This fact is borne out by the use of the Kṛita Mālava era by them (a fact which assumes some significance when we find that the Mauharīs were a close neighbour of the Mālavas of Rajasthan), and also by the earliest epigraphical references to their origin. According to the Harahā Stone Inscription of Īśānavarman,[2] the Maukharīs were the descendants of the hundred sons whom king Aśvapati obtained through the grace of Vaivasvata.[3] On the other hand, according to the *Mahābhārata* the Madra king Aśvapati obtained one hundred sons called the Mālavas born to his queen Mālavī as a result of the *varadāna* granted by Yama Vaivasvata to the king's daughter Sāvitrī.[4] Thus, the combined testimony of the Harahā inscription and the *Mahābhārata* conclusively proves that the Mālavas and the Maukharīs belonged to the same stock and country, Further, we have several other interesting indications which tend to support this conclusion. Firstly, our sources, viz. the *Mahābhārata*, the Harahā inscription and the Nāndsā Yūpa inscription, connect both of these tribes to the solar branch of Kshatriyas. Secondly, like the Mālavas[5] the Maukharīs were also great champions of the Vedic Yajña cult. According to the Harahā record Imperial Maukharīs of Kanauj were great patrons of Vedic sacrifices.[6] Similarly, from the Badvā record we learn that all the three known sons of Bala performed a Trirātra

1. *EI*, XXIII, pp. 42-52; cf. *EI*, XXIV, pp. 251-253.
2. Sircar, *SI*, pp. 385 ff.
3. सुत-शतं लेभे नृपोऽश्वपतिर्व्वैवस्वताद्यद्गुणोदितम् ।
तत्प्रसूता दुरित-वृत्ति-स्था मुखराः क्षितीशाः क्षतारयः ॥३॥
—*Ibid.*, p. 386.
4. पितुश्च ते पुत्रशतं भविता तव मातरि ।
मालव्यां मालवा नाम शाश्वताः पुत्रपौत्रिणः ॥
Mahābhārata (BORI), III, 281, 58.
5. *EI*, XXVII, pp. 252 ff; cf. Mandasor Ins. of 532 A.D., Sircar, *SI*, 411 ff.
6. Sircar, *SI*, pp. 385 ff.

sacrifice.[1] Lastly, the fact that Maukharı principality existed in Kota region (quite close to the Mālava Janapada) the rulers of which used the Kṛita-Mālava era is itself not without significance. These indications are not very strong separately, but when taken collectively they tend to strengthen the theory that the Maukharıs and the Mālavas belonged to the same parent stock.

Another splinter group of the Mālava tribe appears to hava established itself in the old Bharatpur state. This fact is indicated by a dated stone pillar inscription found at Bijayagadh[2] near Bayānā which commemorates the erection ot a Yūpa (obviously the same on which the inscription is engraved) by the king Vishṇuvardhana on the completion of a Puṇḍarıka Yajña.[3] The date, 428, is given both in word and numerical symbols as is the case with the inscription 'A' of the Nāndsā Yūpa.[4] According to Fleet, its script and the find-spot indicate that it must refer its date to the Mālava (or Vikrama) era. In that case it was engraved in the year 371-72 A.D. expired or 372-73 A D. current.[5] The alternative that the era used in it is identical with the Śaka era goes against the palaeography of the record. Further, there is no evidence to suggest that the Śaka reckoning was popular in this part of the country in the fourth century A.D.[6] Thus king Vishṇuvardhana used the era of the Mālavas and like that tribe was interested in the performance of the Vedic sacrifices. Further, his family members adopted *vardhana*-ending names (*viz.*, Vishṇuvardhana, the king of this record and his father Yaśovardhana). Such names were quite popular among the Mālavas also. For example, the grandfather of Nandi Soma of the Nāndsā inscription was Prabhagra (Bhṛigu ?) vardhana and the kings of Western

1. *EI*, XXIII, pp. 42-52.
2. Fleet, *CII*, III, pp. 252-54.
3. कृतो पुण्डरीके यूपोऽयम्प्रतिष्ठापित......

Ibid., p. 253.

4. *EI*, XXVII, pp. 252 ff.
5. Fleet, *op. cit.*, p. 253.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 253 fn. 1.

Malwa and Rajasthan in the sixth century adopted such names as Ādityavardhana, Dravyavardhana and Vishṇuvardhana.[1] The family of Mahārāja Gauri of the Mandasor Fragmentary Inscription of 490 A.D.[2] included kings having the names Rāshṭravardhana and Rājyavardhana. These facts when taken together strongly suggest that the Varīka tribe to which king Vishṇuvardhana of the Bijayagadh document belonged, was also an offshoot of the Malāva stock. The evidence at our disposal on this point is obviously not conclusive but the existence of a ruling family in Bhartpur area, the fourth member of which, viz. Vishṇuvardhana, was ruling in 371-72 A.D. is itself quite an interesting fact. It means that he was a contemporary and also probably a feudatory of Samudragupta and that his family came into power in northern Rajasthan about a century earlier, i.e., towards that last quarter of the third century A.D.

The last and perhaps the most important branch of the Mālavas was the Aulikaras who migrated to and settled down in the Avanti region, i.e. Ujjayinī Dhārā—Mandasor area. This branch popularised the use of the Mālava era there and gave the name Mālava (Malwa) to this region, though here it must be noted and emphasised that the name Malwa for this Janapada became popular only in the post-Harsha period.[3] As we have discussed elsewhere, till then it continued to be known as Avanti and the authors of the Gupta age made a clear distinction between Mālava Janapada and Avanti *deśa* usually locating the former to the north of the latter.

The Aulikaras of Avanti probably supplanted the Kārdamakas in this area but were themselves subdued by Samudragupta who imposed Gupta overlordship over this region. Their history during the Gupta age is intimately connected with the fortunes of southern Rajasthan in that period. We will discuss it in the next chapter.

1. Sircar, *SI*, pp. 410, ff.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 410 and fn. 1; cf. *EI*, XXX, pp. 120 ff.
3. *Vide*, Ch. IV.

The expansion and disintegration of the Mālavas in later times is also indicated by the existence of several localities named Mālava in the various parts of the country, though it is not at all necessary to assume that the Mālavas existed as a political force in all of them. The *Mahābhārata* is aware of the three-fold division of the Mālavas, viz. the Mālavas of eastern, western and northern region. Tārānātha, the Buddhist historian of Tibet, speaks of a Mālava in Prayāga region and villages named Mallāvān and Malawān actually exist respectively in the Hardoi and Fatehpur districts of U.P.[1] Then there is a Mālava country in the Western Ghats which seems to be associated with the present Malavan in the Ratnagiri district. A feudatory of Vikramāditya VI Chālukya is said to have subdued the *sapta Mālavas* upto the Himalayas [2] Here it may be noted however, that all these regions which acquired the name Mālava were not necessarily connected with the Mālavas of Rajasthan, but their existence, no doubt, proves that at some point of time in their history the Mālavas migrated into different parts of the country. We suggest that this expansion took place in the third-fourth century A.D. when, after thier victory over the Śakas, the Mālavas were at the height of their glory and there was no powerful empire which could check their migration to distant regions.

Be it what it may, it cannot be doubted that at least in Rajasthan and adjoining regions the Mālavas established several. independent and semi-independent states in the post-Kushāṇa period. But, as noted above, a republican tribe could not adopt a career of expansionism without loosing its tribal homogeneity. The process of the expansion of the Mālavas was, therefore, bound to be accompanied by the process of their disintegration. Their disintegration was further accentuated by the internal crisis through which they, together with many other republican tribes of the period, were passing. These tribes which dotted the map of north India in this period were gradually realising that they could not hold their own against

1. Cf. Sircar, D.C., *Ancient Malwa and the Vikramāditya Tradition*, pp. 2-3.
2. *Loc. cit.*

the onslaughts of their mighty neighbouring kings. Hence we find that some tribes carried out the experiment of forming loose confederacies (e.g. Yaudheya—Ārjunāyana—Kuṇinda confederacy). But the greatest and most important development which took place as a sort of counter-action to the danger from the monarchical states was that the tribal republics themselves, consciously or unconsciously, absorbed the elements of monarchical polity. For example, though the Lichchhavi relations of the Guptas had a tribal form of policy as the word *Lichchhavayaḥ* i.e. the Lichchhavis occurring on the reverse of the Chandragupta-Kumāradevī types of coins and the term Lichchhavi-dauhitra i.e. daughters' son of the Lichchhavi, used for Samudragupta in the Gupta epigraphs indicates,[1] it is almost certain that the father of Kumāradevī was a hereditory chief. For, otherwise, how could the son of Kumāradevī[2] or Kumāradevī herself,[3] 'inherit' the state of the Lichchhavis ? The same tendency towards monarchism may be detected in the polity of the republican tribes of Rajasthan in this period. The post of the head of the Yaudheya state, for example, was elective and he was not permitted to put his name on the state coinage ; however, he was allowed the royal title *Mahārāja* along with the military title Mahāsenāpati.[4] The latter title indicates that the source of the strength of the Yaudheya Mahārajas was their control over military organisation.[5] Among the Mālavas also the leadership of the tribe had already passed into the hands of persons like Śrī Soma (or Nandi Soma) who, in the Nāndsā Yūpa inscription of the Kṛita year 282 (226 A.D.) claims that he was a scion of the Mālava

1. Altekar, A.S., *The Coinage of the Gupta Empire*, pp. 27 ff; *JIH*, VI, Suppl, p. 10 ff.
2. Goyal, S.R., *HIG*, pp. 94 ff.
3. Altekar, A.S., *Coinage*, pp. 30-31.
4. Fleet, *CII*, III, pp. 251-52.
5. In Central India the Sanakānīkas (who figure as a tribal republic in the Prayāga *praśasti*) had adopted a monarchical constitution several generations earlier than the Udayagiri record of the Sanakānīka feudatory of Chandragupta II which was engraved in Gupta year 82 (401 A.D.)—Sircar, *SI*, pp. 279-80.

CHAPTER III

RAJASTHAN IN THE AGE OF THE GUPTA EMPIRE

Rise of the Guptas

In the last chapter we brought the history of Rajasthan up to the close of the third and the beginning of the fourth century A.D. In the middle of the fourth century the political map of the country was totally changed by the expansion of the Gupta empire under Samudragupta. The Gupta dynasty was founded by Mahārāja Gupta sometime towards the close of the third century.[1] The power and prestige of the dynasty was greatly augmented by the next king Ghaṭotkacha who contracted a matrimonial alliance with the Lichchhavis of Magadha[2] and married his son Chandragupta I with Kumāradevī, the daughter of the Lichchhavi chief.[3] It is now also almost beyond doubt that Samudragupta, son of Mahādevī Kumāradevī was a *dvāmushyāyaṇa* and was regarded as the successor

1. For the original kingdom of the Imperial Guptas, see Allan, *BMC, GD*, (Intro.) p. xiv; Basak, R.G., *HNEI*, p. 6; Banerji, R.D., *AIG*, p. 6; Altekar, *NHIP*, p. 2; Saletore, R.N. *Life in the Gupta Age*, p. 9; Smith, V.A., *EHI*, p. 295; Dandekar, R.N., *Hist. Gup.*, p. 20; Raychaudhuri, H.C., *PHAI*, p 528; B P. Sinha suggests that the home of the Guptas may have been near Ayodhya (*JBORS*, xxxvii, p. 138). But S.R. Goyal believes that the Guptas originally belonged to eastern U.P. with Prayāga as the centre of their power (*HIG*, pp. 41 ff.
2. In the fourth century A D. the Lichchhavis were ruling not only over northern Bihar but Magadha also. Cf. Goyal, *op cit*. pp. 52-53.
3. महाराजश्री-गुप्त-प्रपौत्रस्य महाराज-श्री-घटोत्कच-पौत्रस्य महाराजाधिराज-श्री-चन्द्रगुप्त-पुत्रस्य लिच्छविदौहित्रस्य महादेव्यां कुमारदेव्यामुत्पन्नस्य महाराजाधिराज-श्री-समुद्रगुप्तस्य...

—Sircar, *SI*, p. 267.

known from another Nāndsā Yūpa inscription[1] (which unfortunately carries no date but may, on palaeographical grounds, be regarded as contemporary to the Nāndsā record) with Nandi Soma is correct, it may be assumed that the Mālava chief, like his Yaudheya counterpart, was given the title of *Mahāsenāpati*.[2] In any case, it is quite obvious that when the leadership of a tribal state passed into the hands of hereditary chiefs who were military leaders and claimed royal descent, in reality it could hardly be distinguished from a monarchy though the fiction of its being a *gaṇa*, i.e. a republic, still continued, as the reference to the *Mālava gaṇa vishaya* (i.e. the territory of the Mālava republic) in the line three of the Nāndsā Yūpa inscription 'A' of Nandi Soma proves.[3] This gradual transition of the Mālavas and other tribes from republicanism to monarchical form of government was symptomatic of their inner crisis which must have rendered them inherently weak. No wonder, therefore, if they could not put up a brave resistance to the attempts of Samudragupta to bring them within the sphere of his influence.[4]

1. *EI*, XXVII, pp. 266-67.
2. महासेनापतिस्य (पतेः) भट्टिसोमस्य
   सोगिस्य (सोगेः)-म-
   Loc. cit.
3. Cf. Shukla, D.C., *PRHC*, VI, 1973, pp. 1 ff.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 18.

CHAPTER III

RAJASTHAN IN THE AGE OF THE GUPTA EMPIRE

Rise of the Guptas

In the last chapter we brought the history of Rajasthan up to the close of the third and the beginning of the fourth century A.D. In the middle of the fourth century the political map of the country was totally changed by the expansion of the Gupta empire under Samudragupta. The Gupta dynasty was founded by Mahārāja Gupta sometime towards the close of the third century.[1] The power and prestige of the dynasty was greatly augmented by the next king Ghaṭotkacha who contracted a matrimonial alliance with the Lichchhavis of Magadha[2] and married his son Chandragupta I with Kumāradevī, the daughter of the Lichchhavi chief.[3] It is now also almost beyond doubt that Samudragupta, son of Mahādevī Kumāradevī was a *dvāmushyāyaṇa* and was regarded as the successor

1. For the original kingdom of the Imperial Guptas, see Allan, *BMC, GD*, (Intro.) p. xiv; Basak, R.G., *HNEI*, p. 6; Banerji, R.D., *AIG*, p. 6; Altekar, *NHIP*, p. 2; Saletore, R.N. *Life in the Gupta Age*, p. 9; Smith, V.A., *EHI*, p. 295; Dandekar, R.N., *Hist. Gup.*, p. 20; Raychaudhuri, H.C., *PHAI*, p. 528; B.P. Sinha suggests that the home of the Guptas may have been near Ayodhya (*JBORS*, xxxvii, p. 133). But S.R. Goyal believes that the Guptas originally belonged to eastern U.P. with Prayāga as the centre of their power (*HIG*, pp. 41 ff.

2. In the fourth century A.D. the Lichchhavis were ruling not only over northern Bihar but Magadha also. Cf. Goyal, *op. cit*. pp. 52-53.

3. महाराजश्री-गुप्त-प्रपौत्रस्य महाराज-श्री-घटोत्कच-पौत्रस्य महाराजाधिराज-श्री-चन्द्रगुप्त-पुत्रस्य लिच्छविदौहित्रस्य महादेव्यां कुमारदेव्यामुत्पन्नस्य महाराजाधिराज-श्री-समुद्रगुप्तस्य...

—Sircar, *SI*, p. 267.

to his father as well as his maternal grandfather, who probably did not have any male issue to succeed him.[1] However, till the accession of Samudragupta in c. 350 A.D.,[2] the hold of the Gupta emperor was confined to eastern U.P. (including Prayāga aud Sāketa) and Magadha along with Northern Bihar.[3] But Samudragupta turned out to be a great conqueror. He succeeded in simplifying the political map of the country by exterminating the nine kings of Āryāvarta and reducing the frontier states of eastern and northern regions as well as the tribal states of the Panjab, Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh to submission.[4] Further, he defeated the twelve kings of Deccan and made the Scythian potentates of the North-Western and Western India as well as the kings and peoples of Ceylon and South-East Asia to establish friendly (in some cases probably subordinate) relations with him.[5] Thus he succeeded in effecting political unification of the greater part of the sub-continent by destroying the independence of a large number of states which had come into existence in the post-Kushāṇa period. It is against this background that the history of Rajasthan

1. Cf. Pathak, V.S., *JNSI*, XIX, pt. II, p. 141.
2. The *ĀMMK* gives only twenty-two years and five months to Samudragupta. In that case he must have ascended the throne shortly after 350 A.D. This tradition is corroborated by the fact that Pravarasena I Vākāṭaka who ruled till c. 335 A.D. (*NHIP*, p. 95) [and Bhavanāga, the Bhāraśiva ruler, who died c. 340 A.D. (*ibid*, p. 38) were very senior contemporaries of Samudragupta. It is quite significant that Bhavanāga does not figure in the list of the Nāga kings uprooted by Samudragupta.
3. According to the *Vishṇu Purāṇa* (Pargiter, *DKA*, p. 53., fn. 8) the early Gupta kingdom was a joint-state of the Guptas and the Magadhas (obviously the Lichchhavis) and Prayāga, the region along the Gaṅgā and Magadha were included in it (*HIG*, p. 50 f; *NHIP*, p. 134). The description of the *Vāyu Purāṇa* adds Sāketa to the list of these regions (Pargiter, *op.cit.*, p. 73).
4. Sircar, *SI*, p. 264 f.
5. Sircar, *ibid.*, p. 266; for a detailed analysis of the evidence of the Prayāga *praśasti* of Samudragupta, vide *CA*, pp. 8 ff; *NHIP*, pp. 139 ff; *HIG*, pp. 128 ff.

in the two centuries that elapsed from the accession of Samudragupta to the fall of the Gupta empire should be studied.

Samudragupta And Rajasthan

At the time when empire-building activities of Samudragupta commenced, Rajasthan was inhabited by a large number of ancient tribes such as the Mālavas of the Ajmer-Tonk-Mewar region, the Ārjunāyanas of the Jaipur-Delhi-Agra division, the Yaudheyas of northern Rajasthan and the adjoining regions of the Panjab and the Ābhīras of Abiria in southern Rajasthan. All the tribes have been enumerated by Harishena in the *praśasti* of his master.[1] We have discussed their history up to the beginning of the fourth century in the preceding chapter. Apart from them, there was one more tribe which does not find mention in the Prayāga *praśasti*. That is the Varika tribe of the Bharatpur area. It is not known to have existed in the pre-Samudragupta period. Its existence is revealed only by a stone pillar inscription found at Bijayagadh near Bayana.[2] It records the erection of a *yūpa* or pillar (obviously the same on which the inscription is engraved) by the king Vishṇuvardhana on the completion of a Puṇḍarīka sacrifice.[3] The inscription carries a date—428—which is given both in words and numerical symbols. It describes the king Vishṇuvardhana as the excellent son of Yaśovardhana and the excellent son's son of Yaśorāta and the excellent son of the son's son of Vyāghrarāta.[4] Thus, from the inscription it would appear that

1. मालवार्जुनायन-यौधेय-माद्रकाभीर-प्रार्जुन-
सनकानीक-काक-खरपरिकादिभिश्च......

—*Sircar, SI*, p. 205.

2. Fleet, *CII*, III, p. 252 ff.

3. कृतो पुण्डरीके यूपोऽयम्प्रतिष्ठापितः...

—*Ibid.*, p. 253.

4. सुप्रतिष्ठितराज्यनामधेयेन श्रीविष्णुवर्द्धनेन
वरिकेण यशोवर्द्धन-सत्पुत्रेण यशोरात-सत्पौत्रेण
व्याघ्ररातसत्प्रपौत्रेण

—*Loc. cit.*

the family of Vishṇuvardhana was in existence at least for four generations before the year 428 A.D., though probably not as a political power. Unfortunately, the record does not mention the era to which its date is to be referred, but, as pointed out by Fleet,[1] the script and the findspot of this inscription indicate that it was no other than the famous Kṛita-Mālava era. The date of the inscription consequently comes to 371-72 A.D. expired, or 372-73 A.D. current. Thus Vishṇuvardhana Varika was apparently a contemporary, probably a feudatory of Samudragupta. We shall discuss the nature of the relationship of this ruler with the Gupta emperor later in greater detail.

Here it may be noted that the Allahabad Pillar Inscription of Samudragupta does not mention the Maukharī principality of Badva (in the former Kota state) the existence of which in the third century is revealed by the Badva Stone Pillar (Yūpa) Inscription of the Kṛita year 295 (=238 A.D.) of the sons of Mahāsenāpati Bala.[2] It is quite possible that this branch of the Maukharīs had disappeared from the political scene of Rajasthan by the middle of the fourth century or had become subordinate to some neighbouring power which rendered its separate mention in the Prayāga *praśasti* unnecessary.

In the Prayāga *praśasti* of Samudragupta and Mālavas, the Ārjunāyanas, the Yaudheyas and the Ābhīras of Rajasthan and some other tribes of the Panjab and Madhya Pradesh have been grouped with the *pratyanta* states of eastern and northern India whose kings were compelled to pay all kinds of taxes (*Sarvvakaradāna*), carry out the imperial commands (*ājñākaraṇa*) and pay personal homage to the emperor (*praṇāmāgamana*).[3] Here it is interesting to note that like the monarchical states, the rulers of these tribal republics were also expected to attend the royal court personally. It shows that in the eyes of the emperor their status in their own respective

1. *Loc. cit.*
2. Vide, the preceding ch; *EI*, XXII, p. 52; Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 91 f.
3. Fleet, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

states was not very much different from that of the kings of monarchical *pratyanta* states. In any case, from the Prayāga *praśasti* it is quite apparent that Samudragupta established his suzerainty over the greater part of Rajasthan. But how and when his suzerainty was imposed over the republics of Rajasthan is not known. This problem is inextricably connected with the question of the basis on which the powers defeated or subjugated by Samudragupta have been enumerated in the four lists of the prose passage of his *praśasti*. Some scholars such as Jayaswal believe that they have been enumerated in geographical sequence,[1] but it is palpably wrong because in the third list, in which the republican states of Rajasthan have been included, Harisheṇa, the author of the *praśasti*, has also enumerated the powers of eastern India, Himalayan region, the Panjab and Madhya Pradesh. Similarly, the suggestion that Harisheṇa has enumerated these powers in chronological order—that is in the order in which they were defeated[2]—is also obviously wrong; for it would be absurd to assume that all the powers of any particular list were subdued by Samudragupta at one particular time. Harisheṇa has grouped all the powers defeated or subjugated by Samudragupta in different periods of his career into four lists in accordance with the policies adopted towards them. This suggestion throws a new light on the *modus operandi* of the policy of the emperor towards Rajasthan. For it means that the "nature of the challenge which these states threw to his statesmanship and conditions in which they were placed and his responses must have differed accordingly. In the initial stages of his empire-building activities, when he had yet to emerge as the supreme ruler of Āryāvarta, he must have moved very cautiously. It is quite possible that at that time he tried to cultivate friendship with the tribal people of the Punjab and Rajasthan who, being situated beyond the Nāga Kingdoms were, according to the *maṇḍala* doctrine of inter-state relations, his natural friends (*mitras*) and later on, when

1. Jayaswal, K.P., *Hist. Ind.*, p. 135.
2. Dubreuil, J., *AHD*, p. 61.

he became undisputed master of Āryāvarta, he reduced his erstwhile friends to the status of his subordinate allies. May be, in some cases he had to exert some pressure to bring these lovers of freedom to their senses, as he might have put. It is also quite possible that some of the tribal states offered voluntary submission and rendered him some help against the neighbouring kings or against those to whom at that time they were owing their allegiance."[1]

For the post-Samudragupta period there is no record comparable to the Prayāga *praśasti* which may help us in assessing the extent of the hold of the successors of Samudragupta over this part of the country. In view of this fact some scholars such as A.S. Altekar[2] have opined that the tribal republics mentioned in the Prayāga *praśasti* continued to flourish even after Samudragupta. "It is important to note in this connection", he argues, "that we have no evidence whatsoever to show that the homelands of these republics were ever annexed to the Gupta empire. The fact that no monuments of the Gupta rule have been found in Rajputana or beyond Mathura shows that the Guptas could hardly exercise any effective control over these republics. They may well have continued their semi-independent existence down to the middle of the 5th century A.D. when they appear to have been engulfed in the Hūṇa avalanche."[3] The theory of Altekar is now supported by some other scholars also.[4] But we are not inclined to accept this view. Firstly, it is a patent fact of history that the tribal republics of Rajasthan which were in existence till the middle of the fourth century are not mentioned anywhere as independent or semi-independent entities in the post-Samudragupta period. They, no doubt, continued to exist as social groups or castes and in some cases (as is the case with the Mālavas) their names continued to exist as the name of the people living in a particular region which acquired the name

1. Dubreuil, J., *AHD*, p. 155.
2. *NHIP*, p. 35.
3. *Ibid.*, pp. 35-36.
4. Thakur, U., *The Hūṇas in India*, p. 223.

of that tribe. No amount of explanation by the supporters of Altekar's theory can explain this basic fact away. It is, indeed, one of the most important proofs of the great hold of the imperial Guptas over Rajasthan for a considerably long period. For, at least in the present state of our knowledge, one cannot give any cogent reason for explaining the disappearance of the tribal republics of Rajasthan from the middle of the fourth century A.D. other than the imperialistic policy followed by Samudragupta. It may, however, be pointed out that the policy of Samudragupta of destroying the existence of these republics of Rajasthan as political entities could not succeed so effectively if they had not become inherently weak on account of the growth of the monarchical tendencies in their polity which we have already discussed.[1]

Here it would not be out of place to evaluate K.P. Jayaswal's criticism of Samudragupta's policy towards republican tribes. Jayaswal wrote his famous *History of India, from 150 A.D. to 350 A.D.* (Lahore, 1933) in a period when Indian nation was struggling against British imperialism. It was quite natural for our historians of that period to glorify the ancient empire-builders of our country while at the same time idolising our republican tradition.[2] But sometimes the desire to glorify the empire-building activities of our great rulers ran counter to the glorification of our republican heritage. Jayaswal's book apparently suffers from this dichotomy. He, on the one hand, highly appreciates the efforts of Samudragupta to unify the country. "It should be noted" he states, "that he (Samudragupta) did not over-do militarism. He was fully conscious of the value of a policy of peace .....The psychology of the nation was entirely changed and the outlook became lofty and magnanimous. It was a psychology directly borrowed from the Emperor. The Hindus of his day thought of big undertakings. They contributed high, elegant and magnani-

1. Cf. *supra*, Ch. 2.
2. For a discussion on the impact of national movement on Indian historiography see Philips', *Historians of India, Pakistan and Ceylon*, pp. 417 ff.

mous literature. The literary people became literary Kuberas to their countrymen and literary empire-builders outside India......Sanskrit became the official language, and it became entirely a new language. Like the Gupta coins and Gupta sculpture, it reproduced the Emperor, it became majestic and musical, as it had never been before and as it never became after again. The Gupta emperor made a new language, and in fact a new nation."[1] But after having lavished this praise on Samudragupta, in the following pages of his work, Jayaswal does not hesitate to denounce him for the destruction of the republican tribes. "Samudragupta, like Alexander", he laments, "killed the free spirit of his country. He destroyed the Mālavas and the Yaudheyas who were the nursery of freedom and many others of their class. The social system of the republican communities was based on equality. They knew no caste. They consisted of one caste only. The orthodox system, on the other hand, was based on inequality and caste where mass patriotism could not be mobilised as it could easily be done amongst the Mālavas, the Yaudheyas, the Madrakas, the Pushyamitras, the Ābhīras and the Lichchhavis. They were the exercise ground for state-making, for patriotism, for individual ambitions, capabilities and leadership. But under Samudragupta and his descendants they all merged into an organised, officialised, orthodox caste-system and an orthodox political system which recognised and fostered monarch and imperialism.........The life-giving element was gone......
...They (the Guptas) were tyrants to Hindu constitutional freedom.......[2]

From the passages quite above it is quite apparent that Jayaswal was suffering from dichotomy of eulogizing the empire-building activities of Samudragupta which led to the unification of the large part of the country and at the same time showing that the destruction of the lofty republican traditions of our ancient tribes was the result of the wicked and

1. Jayaswal, *Hist. Ind.*, pp. 204-6.
2. *Ibid.*, pp. 210-11.

selfish policy of the Gupta emperor. Such an approach was quite natural for a historian who was, consciously or unconsciously, trying to show that political unity of India is not something new and that it was the imperialistic policy of the Britishers in modern times which was responsible for the destruction of the democratic way of life in our country. But now it can easily be conceded that Samudragupta's achievements, which could not have been possible without the establishment of a unified empire, cannot be appreciated if we denounce him for the destruction of the republican tribes of Rajasthan and adjoining areas.

The exact nature of the policy of Samudragupta towards the various tribal republics of Rajasthan is not definitely known. For example, it is not even certain whether the tribal state of the Mālavas mentioned in the Prayāga *praśasti* and the Aulikara state of Daśapura were identical. So far no scholar appears to have discussed this question in detail, although many of them have tacitly assumed that these two political entities were not different. To us it does not appear to be so. We feel that the Mālava tribe mentioned in the Prayāga *praśasti* lived in the Ajmer-Tonk-Mewar area and that the Aulikaras who emerged as a political power in the middle of the fourth century in the Deśapura-Madhyamikā region of Malwa and Southern Rajasthan were a separate political entity though racially they were probably a branch of the Mālavas themselves. For we have good grounds to believe that Mālava Janapada, as a political entity distinct from the Avanti Janapada, continued to exist till at least the sixth-seventh century A.D. We shall have occasion to discuss this point in detail later. It is, however, more or less, certain that it ceased to enjoy its old tribal constitution and became a monarchical state.

In the political system of Samudragupta Yaudheya and other tribal Janapadas of Rajasthan were forced to pay all the taxes, obey imperial commands and send their chiefs to pay personal homage to the emperor.[1] In other matters, perhaps,

1. सर्व-कर-दानाज्ञाकरण-प्रणामागमन-परितोषित-प्रचण्ड-शासनस्य
Sircar, *SI*, pp. 263 ff.

they were given a measure of internal autonomy though it could not have been very great as the subjects taken over by the central government did not leave much scope for the local rulers. It appears that Samudragupta tried to evolve a feudal structure in this region. The policy of *sarvvakaradāna, ājnākaraṇa* and *praṇāmāgamana* proves that in actual practice the position of the ruling chiefs must have been something like that of the *sāmantas* of Harsha as described in the *Harshacharita* of Bāṇa. According to the second chapter of this work when Bāṇa visited the camp of Harsha he found that a large number of *sāmantas* had come to pay homage to the emperor personally (प्रणामविडम्बनाभयचलायमानमौलिभिरिव). Apparently, a status somewhat akin to the one enjoyed by the *sāmantas* of Harsha was accorded to the Rajasthan feudatories of Samudragupta.

Continuity of the Gupta Rule in Rajasthan

According to R.C. Majumdar, the tribal republics of Rajasthan were brought under the direct governance of the Guptas by Chandragupta II, the son and successor of Samudragupta, on whom "fell the task of completing the conquest begun by Samudragupta,...and assimilating into the organisation of the empire, not only the tribal states and kingdoms on the border but also the territories ruled by foreign hordes like the Śakas and the Kushāṇas."[1] Some other scholars have also opined, without adducing any reason whatsoever, that the republican states of Rajasthan enumerated in the Prayāga *praśasti* were finally merged in the Gupta imperial system during the rule of Chandragupta II.[2] We beg to differ. So far as the available evidence goes we do not know anything about the activities and achievements of Chandragupta II in Rajasthan, though he is known to have conquered the neighbouring regions of Gujarat towards the close of his reign,

1. *CA*, p. 23.

2. Upadhyaya, V., *Gupta Sāmrājya kā Itihāsa*, pt. I, p. 90.

probably sometime after 410 A.D.[1] But this fact cannot be pressed into service for proving the persuance of the policy of the total amalgamation of the republics of Rajasthan by him. We, therefore, believe that unless some evidence to the contrary is forthcoming the credit for the political reorganisation of Rajasthan should be given to Samudragupta himself who was one of the greatest empire builders of ancient India.

The continuity of the Gupta rule over Rajasthan in the post-Samudragupta period is also indicated by the Mandasor Stone Pillar Inscription of Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana (known date 532 A.D.).[2] Yaśodharman was the ruler of Malwa and the greater part of Rajasthan, and belonged to the Mālava tribe of the Ajmer-Tonk-Mewar region. As discussed below Yaśodharman himself ruled over this region. Now, in his epigraphs he claims that he conquered even those regions which were not enjoyed by the Gupta Lords.[3] This reference to Gupta rulers in plural by a king belonging to the Mālava tribe of Rajasthan who himself ruled over the greater part of this region may be regarded as a proof of the fact that the Guptas ruled over Rajasthan for a considerably long time and not in the reign period of Samudragupta alone.

Unfortunately, no Gupta record has so far been discovered in Rajasthan except probably a small seal which refers to the *adhikaraṇa* of some Kumārāmātya.[4] It was found at Dhalia near Bikaner. But the non-discovery of such inscriptions from a

1. Goyal, *HIG*, pp. 246 ff. Goyal has given good grounds to believe that the Śaka conquest of Chandragupta II took place towards the close of his reign, and not earlier.

2. Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 418 ff.

3. ये भुक्ता गुप्त-नाथैर्न सकल-वसुधाक्लान्ति-दृष्ट-प्रतापैः...

—Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 419.

Fleet (*op. cit.*, p. 148) translated the term 'Guptanātha' as 'Lords of the Gupta'; Jayaswal (*IHI*, pp. 40-41) corrected the translation as the 'Gupta-Lord's.

4. Sharma, Dasharatha, *Rajasthan through the Ages*, Vol. I, p. 69.

particular region cannot be regarded as a proof of its independence. After all we do not have even a single Gupta inscription from Bihar belonging to the first 150 years of the Gupta rule (c.320 to c.467 A.D.).[1] The first Gupta record found from this region is the famous Bihar stone Pillar Inscription belonging to some unknown successor of Skandagupta.[2]

However, numismatic evidence of the intimate relationship of the Guptas with Rajasthan is quite impressive. In this connection first of all we may mention the famous Bayana hoard found near Hullanpur village in the Bharatpur region. It is the biggest hoard of Gupta gold coins discovered so far. It consisted of about 2,100 coins, but only 1821 of them could be recovered.[3] They included the coins of Chandragupta I, Samudragupta, Kācha, Chandragupta II, Kumāragupta I and Kramāditya (Skandagupta?).[4] It is quite obvious that these coins must have been in circulation in eastern and northern Rajasthan and the adjoining regions of Panjab and Uttar Pradesh at the time when this hoard was buried towards the end

1. Excepting of course the Gayā *dānapatra* of Samudragupta which is either a spurious record or a late copy of a genuine record. For the various views on this subject vide Fleet, *CII*, III, pp. 254 ff; Sircar, *SI*, pp. 272 ff; *EI*, XXVI, p. 135 f; Majumdar, R.C. *IC*, XI, pp. 225 ff; Ghosh, A, *EI*, XXV, p. 52 f; Goyal, *HIG*, p. 48, pp. 111 ff; Banerji, R.D., *AIG*, p. 7 f and Dandekar, R.N., *Hist. Gup.* p. 44.

2. Fleet (*op. cit.*, p. 48) ascribed this record to Skandagupta. But Majumdar (*IC*, X, pp. 70 ff) and Sinha (*DKM*, pp. 26 ff) have shown good grounds to believe that it belongs to the post-Skandagupta period.

3. Altekar, A.S., *The Coinage of the Gupta Empire*, pp. 310 ff.

4. The break up of the hoard is :—

Chandragupta I	—	10 coins
Samudragupta	—	183 ,,
Kācha	—	16 ,,
Chandragupta II	—	983 ,,
Kumāragupta I	—	628 ,,
Kramāditya I (Skandagupta ?)	—	1 ,,
Total		1821

—*ibid.*, p. 316.

of the reign of Kumāragupta I or during the reign of Skandagupta. This fact is a very strong indication of the continuity of Gupta influence over this part of Rajasthan in the post-Samudragupta period. Other regions of Rajasthan have also yielded Gupta coins in considerable number.[1] Several coins of Chandragupta I, Samudragupta and Chandragupta II were found in a mound called Bundewali Dungri, near village Moroli, in the Jaipur area.[2] Some coins of Samudragupta and Chandragupta II were discovered at some unknown sites of Jaipur region. Mewar area had also yielded several Gupta gold and silver coins.[3] Five silver Gupta coins were discovered by G.H. Ojha from Ajmer and one silver coin of Kumāragupta I was discovered by Satya Prakash from Naliasar—Sambhar.[4] Further, in 1962, the Department of Archaeology of the Government of Rajasthan, obtained six coins from Bhairh near Rairh in Tonk area, including one coin of Samudragupta, four of Chandragupta II and one of the king Kidāra of the Kushāṇa tribe.[5]

Apart from the evidence discussed above the impact of the Gupta 'classical-culture', especially in the domain of art, religion and socio-economic life, on Rajasthan indirectly suggests that this region like other parts of the vast Gupta empire was included within the Gupta politico-cultural orbit.

The Aulikaras (Varmans) of Daśapura-Madhyamikā Region

Now let us discuss the history of the tribes of Rajasthan in the Gupta age in some detail. First, the Mālavas. To us it appears that their separate entity in the form of the Mālava Janapada (Ajmer-Tonk-Mewar area) was maintained by Samudragupta but a branch of them, the Aulikaras by

1. Cf. *The Researcher*, Vols. XII-XIII, 1972-73, pp. 8 ff (App.).
2. Sharma, D, *RTA*, pp. 63.
3. *Loc. cit.*
4. *Loc. cit.*
5. Sharma, G.N., *Rajasthāna ke Itihāsa ke Srota*, p. 23; *JNSI*, XXXII, pt. II, pp. 203 ff.

name, was turned into a monarchical state in the southern Rajasthan and Mandasor (ancient Madhyamikā-Daśapura area). For the history of the Gupta age, the Mandasor region which is even now surrounded on three sides by Rajasthan, may be regarded as a part of southern Rajasthan. The inscriptions of the early Aulikaras have been discovered, apart from other places, from Gangdhar[1] in Jhalawar District and of the Later-Aulikaras from Chhoti Sadri[2] and Chittor[3] (ancient Madhyamikā). Apparently, therefore, the Aulikaras may be regarded as a power of southern Rajasthan with their political seat at Mandasor. They were a Mālava dynasty like the Sogins and Maukharis.[4] According to D.C. Sircar perhaps they were responsible for the name Mālava being applied to to Malwa—the wide region of central and western India including Avanti (region round Ujjayinī) and Ākara or Daśārṇa (region round Vidiśā).[5] However, it would do well to remember that this region came to be known as Malwa only after the seventh century. Under the Guptas the Aulikaras enjoyed more internal independence than other protected states of the empire. They had the privilege of using their own reckoning i.e., the Kṛita era (also known as the Mālava or Vikrama era) in place of the era of their overlord.[6] The first known ruler of Aulikāra family was Jayavarman (360-75) who was succeeded in turn by Siṁhavarman (c. 375-395), Naravarman (Known dates 404 and 417), Viśvavarman (known date 423) and Bandhuvarman (known date 436). According to K.C. Jain Jayavarman seized the territory around Daśapura from

1. Sircar, *SI*, pp. 399 ff.
2. *EI*, Vol. XXX, pp. 120 ff; *IHQ*, XXXIII, pp. 314 ff.
3. *EI*, Vol. XXXIV, pp. 53 ff.
4. Sircar, D.C., *Ancient Malwa and Vikramāditya Tradition*, p. 11. *PRHC*, Vol. V., 1972, pp. 16 ff.
5. Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 12.
6. In the Bihar Kotra Stone Inscription of the time of Naravarman this era has been called 'औलिकरस्य राज्यसंवत्सरे' (the Aulikara era). Sircar, *SI*, p. 399.

the Sakas sometime during the reign of Mahākshatrapa Rudrasena II (351-364 A.D.).[1] This ruler belongs to the period when reorganisation of North Indian political set up took place under Samudragupta. As the Varmans of Assam and the Pāṇḍavas, Parivrājakas and Uchchakalpas of Bundelkhand—Baghelkhand began their career precisely in this period it may be reasonably assumed that Samudragupta followed the policy of appointing his partisans as his subordinate kings in the newly conquered regions and that all these powers, including the Aulikaras, owed their political emergence to the Gupta emperor. Jayavarman was succeeded by Siṁhavarman.[2] He was identified by some earlier historians such as H.P. Shastri,[3] V. Smith[4] and R.D. Banerji[5] with Siṁhavarman, the father of Chandravarman of the Susunia inscription[6] (West Bengal) who has been described in this record as the ruler of Pushkaraṇa. This place was identified by these scholars with Pushkara, near Ajmer in Rajasthan. Further, they identified Chandravarman of the Susunia inscription with the king Chandra of the Mehrauli Iron Pillar Inscription[7] and concluded that the Aulikaras became imperial power in the period immediately preceding the rise of the Guptas. But now it has been conclusively established that Chandravarman of the Susunia record had nothing to do with the Aulikaras, and Pushkaraṇa, over which he ruled, was no other than Pokarana situated about twenty miles from Susunia.[8]

The Aulikara family, however, rose to prominance under Naravarman (known date 404 A.D.),[9] the son and successor of

1. Jain, K.C., *Malwa Through the Ages*, p. 251.
2. Mandasor Stone Inscription of the time of Naravarman, Sircar, *SI*, pp. 397 ff.
3. *EI*, XII., pp. 315 ff; XIII., p. 133.
4. *Early History of India*, 307, fn. 1.
5. *The Age of the Imperial Guptas*, p. 10 f.
6. Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 351-52; *EI*, XIII, p. 133.
7. Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 283 ff.
8. For a detailed criticism of this theory vide, Sharma, G.R., *IHQ*, XXI, pp. 202, ff.
9. Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 397 ff.

Siṁhavarman, as is indicated by his high sounding epithets like Devendra—Vikrama.[1] He was succeeded by his son Viśvavarman (known date 423 A.D.)[2] The Gangdhar inscription omits the name of his suzerain and describes him as the bravest among kings.[3] This fact and also the use of the Mālava era by the Varmans of Daśapura has led some scholars to believe that the Aulikaras became independent and threw off the yoke of Gupta suzerainty during the reign of Naravarman. While the use of the Gupta era by dynasty did indicate the acceptance by it of the authority of the imperial Guptas, the non-use of the Gupta era or use of a different era did not necessarily mean its independence from their suzerainty. It merely proves the popularity of that particular era in the region. It is significant that even Bandhuvarman, who was definitely subordinate to Kumāragupta I, used the Mālava era also in his Mandasor Stone Inscription.[4] And if the Mālavas were subordinate to the Guptas in the time of Bandhuvarman what is there to prove that his ancestors enjoyed independent status ? On the contrary, the use of the title *Siṁhavikrāntagāmi* (the follower of Siṁhavikrānta i.e. Chandragupta II)[5] and of *Goptā* (which was used for governor in the Gupta administrative terminology)[6] for Viśvavarman in the Mandasor Stone

1. Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 398.
2. Gangadhar Stone Inscription of Viśvavarman, Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 399 ff.
3. महीन्नृपतिप्रवीरे

   —*Loc. cit.*
4. चतुस्समुद्रान्त-विलोल-मेखलां
   सुमेरु-कैलाश-बृहत्पयोधराम् ।
   वनान्त-वान्त-स्फुट-पुष्प-हासिनीं
   कुमारगुप्ते प्रिथिवीं (पृथिवीं) प्रशासति ।।

   —Sircar, *SI*, p. 304.

   For various views on this problem, cf. Fleet, *CII*, *III*, p. 29 ff.; Bhandarkar, *JBBRAS*, XVII, pt. II, pp. 94 ff; Jagannath, *JIH*; XVIII, pp. 118 ff; Sharma, Dasharatha, *IC*, VI, p. 110; Majumdar, R.C., *NHIP*, pp. 181 ff.
5. Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 398.
6. Cf. Verse 7 of the Junagarh record in which Skandagupta claims to have appointed *goptās* in all the *deśas* i.e. provinces (*SI*, p. 309).

Inscription[1] of the Mālava years 493 and 520 and the fact that Chandragupta II conquered the Śakas of the Western India (a success which could hardly be accomplished if he did not rule over Malwa) indicate that Daśapura must have been subject to the Gupta authority during the reign of Chandragupta II. And if Naravarman and Viśvavarman (contemporaries of Chandragupta II) were subordinate to the imperial authority of the Guptas what is there to assume that Jayavarman and Siṁhavarman were independent rulers ? Therefore, to us it appears to be a very reasonable assumption that these rulers were also subordinate to the Gupta authority and Jayavarman, the first king of the dynasty owed his royal glory to the Gupta emperor Samudragupta.

The Yaudheya Region

In the pre-Gupta period the Yaudheyas were the most powerful state in North Rajasthan. Their history and importance during the Scythian period and their subsequent independence have been discussed in the preceding chapter. In the middle of the fourth century A.D. they were also incorporated in the expanding Gupta empire. Their history after their subordination to the Guptas is not known. However, in this connection we would like to draw the attention of the scholars to a very interesting fact. As is well known, a stone inscription of the Yaudheyas has been discovered from Bijayagadh, about two miles to the south-west of Bayana in the former Bharatpur state of Rajasthan.[2] It is inscribed in Sanskrit language and from the point of view of script it may be dated c. fourth century A.D.[3] It refers to a leader of Yaudheya tribe who was awarded the titles *Mahārāja* and *Mahāsenāpati*

1. समान-धीश्शुक्र-वृहस्पतिभ्यां
   ललामभूतो शुचि पार्थिवानाम् ।
   रणेषु यः पार्थ-समानकर्म्मा
   वभूव गोप्ता नृप-विश्ववर्म्मा ॥२४॥
   —Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 304.
2. Fleet, *CII*, III, p. 251 f.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 251.

by the republic.[1] His name has unfortunately been lost. Now from this very place, just near the fort wall where the above mentioned Yaudheya inscription was found, an inscription of the king Vishṇuvardhana of the Varika tribe has been discovered.[2] The epigraph states that the royalty and name of Vishṇuvardhana were well-established and that he had performed the ceremony of Puṇḍarīka sacrifice.[3] The inscription also records the name of his three immediate ancestors, namely the father Yaśovardhana, the grandfather Yaśorāta and the great-grand-father Vyāghrarāta, though they have not been given any royal titles. According to this document the king Vishṇuvardhana was ruling in the year 428, obviously of the Kṛita-Mālava era,[4] corresponding to 370-71 A.D. expired or 372-73 A.D. current. In the circumstances, it needs no arguments to prove that Vishṇuvardhana must have been a subordinate ruler under Samudragupta. Bijayagadh area was definitely included in the former Yaudheya state. This place is only two miles away from Bayana where the famous hoard of 1821 Gupta gold coins, the largest ever discovered in the country, was unearthed.[5] It may, therefore, be concluded that after the submission of the Yaudheyas Samudragupta appointed Vishṇuvardhana as his subordinate in this region. As discussed above, the policy of appointing his partisans over the regions which were brought by him under his control was followed by him, in Kāmarūpa, Bundelkhand-Baghelkhand and Malwa also. It is also quite possible that Varika tribe to which king Vishṇuvardhana belonged was an off-shoot of the Mālava tribe, for he, like the Mālavas, used the Kṛita-Mālava era, performed Vedic sacrifice (so popular among the various branches of the Mālavas)[6] and himself alongwith his family

1. यौधेयगणपुरस्कृतस्य महाराजमहासेनापते: ।

Fleet, CII, III, p. 251.

2. Fleet., *op. cit.*, pp. 252-254.
3. कृते पुण्डरीके यूपोऽयम्प्रतिष्ठापित:

—*ibid.*, p. 253.

4. Fleet, *Loc. cit.*
5. Altekar, A.S., *The Coinage of the Gupta Empire*, p. 310.
6. Cf. Ch. II.

members bore names popular among the Mālavas.[1] We, however, admit that the Mālava lineage of Vishṇuvardhana, though a possibility un-contradicted by any known fact of history, is yet to be definitely proved.

The Vākāṭaka Invasion of Rajasthan in the Middle of the Fifth Century

Apart from the Mālavas and Yaudheyas the history of any other tribe of Rajasthan enumerated in the Prayāga *praśasti* (viz., the Ārjunāyanas and the Ābhīras) and the nature of the political set-up which Samudragupta might have created in their territories is not known. Actually the history of Rajasthan during the greater part of the fifth century which saw the high watermark of Gupta imperialism is only cursorily known, though it can hardly be doubted that in the third quarter of this century, i.e. till about the end of the rule of Skandagupta (last known date 467 A.D.) greater part of at least northern, eastern and southern Rajasthan, possibly the western region also, continued to be ruled by local powers which accepted Gupta suzerainty with varying degrees of subordination. But no connected account of their history is available from any source. There is, however, one important event which throws interesting light on the political turmoil in the southern part of Rajasthan. It is the possible invasion of the Vākātakas of this area in the early years of the second half of the fifth century A D. A detailed background of the history of the Gupta-Vākāṭaka relations is, however, necessary to understand the cause and the nature of this invasion.

The Vākāṭaka dynasty of Vidarbha was by far the most important political power of southern India in the Gupta age. During the reign of Pravarasena I (c. 275-335 A.D.)[2] it became

1. The grandfather of Nandi Soma of the Nandsa Yupa Inscription (*EI*, Vol. XXVII, pp. 12 ff.) was Prabhāgra (?) vardhana. The rulers of the Mandasor in the sixth century A.D. had *Vardhana* ending names, Viz., Ādityavardhana, Dravyavardhana and Vishṇuvardhana.
2. For the chronology of the Vākāṭakas see *NHIP*, pp. 94-95; Mirashi, V.V., *Vākāṭaka Rājavaṁśa kā Itihāsa tathā Abhilekha*, pp. 7-10; *IHQ*. XXIV, pp. 148 ff.

an imperial power. He performed as many as four horse sacrifices.[1] But Rudrasena I, his grandson and successor, was defeated and killed by Samudragupta who incorporated the Vākāṭaka regions north of the Vindhyas in his empire.[2] During the reign of Chandragupta II, the Vākāṭakas became an ally of the Guptas when Prabhāvatī, the daughter of Chandragupta II, was married to Rudrasena II, the grandson of Rudrasena I in c. 380 A.D. As she became a widow quite early in her life and to bear the burden of administration as the regent of her minor sons (one of whom, Divākarasena, died a premature death after the thirteenth year of his reign under the regency of Prabhāvatīguptā),[3] the influence of Chandragupta II in the Vākāṭaka court became almost a political hold.[4] Pravarasena II (the second son of Rudrasena II), who assumed the reins of government in 410 A.D., ruled for about 30 years.[5] He was a man of amiable disposition and his relations with Kumāragupta I (415-455 A.D.), the step-brother of Prabhāvatī were apparently very cordial.[6] He was greatly influenced by his mother who was alive at least till his 23rd regnal year[7] and was apparently very proud of her father's family.[8] But in the middle of the fifth century, when, on the one hand, Kumāragupta I became very old and

1. अग्निष्टोमाप्तोर्य्यामोक्थ्य-षोडश्यातिरात्र-वाजपेय-बृहस्पति-साद्यस्क्र-चतुरश्वमेध- याजिन:

—Sircar, *SI*, p. 443.

2. The identification of Rudrasena I with Rudrasena of the Prayāga *praśasti* proposed by Jayaswal (*Hist Ind.*, pp. 141 ff) and others (Mookerji, R.K., *Gupta Empire*, p. 23; cf. *IHQ*. I, pt. II, p. 254) is doubted by Altekar (*NHIP*, p. 104; *IC*. IX, pp- 99 ff.).
3. Mirashi, V.V., *Vākāṭaka Rājavaṁśa kā Itihāsa tathā Abhilekha*, pp. 29-30; Altekar, A.S., *NHIP*., pp. 111-115.
4. *NHIP*, p. 112.
5. Cf. his Pandhurṇā *dānaśāsana* of 29th regnal year, (Mirashi *op. cit.*, p. 211).
6. Now more than a dozen grants of Pravarasena II are available but none of them mentions any of his military achievements.
7. Cf. his Tiroḍī *dānapatra* (Mirashi. *op. cit.*, p. 190).
8. Cf. that Prabhāvatī gives geneology of her father's family in her own records and uses the cognomen-*guptā* even after her marriage.

the burden of the Gupta administration fell on the shoulders of young princes Skandagupta, Purugupta etc., and on the other, Narendrasena (c. 440-460 A.D.), the son of Pravarasena II, became the master of the Vākāṭaka kingdom, the bond of blood relationship between the two royal houses obviously became weaker. It was, therefore, not an unnatural ambition on the part of the Gupta princes to make a fresh attempt to bring the Vākāṭakas within the sphere of their influence. As has been shown in a recent study,[1] the Guptas did it when they gave help to the Nala king Bhavattavarman of South Kosala to invade the Vākāṭakas in that period. As Bhavattavarman, after succeeding in conquering the Vākāṭaka capital itself, retired to Prayāga, the capital of the Guptas,[2] and as it was probably he who issued the *repousse* coins bearing the title 'Mahendrāditya' and 'Vikramāditya' (the titles of Kumāragupta I and Skandagupta) and as he was (like Kumāragupta I) a devotee of Kārttikeya and named his son Skandavarman (who became a devotee of lord Vishṇu),[3] it needs no further evidence to show that in this period the Nalas were a subordinate ally of the Guptas and they invaded the Vākāṭaka territory with the back-and support of their overlords.

But very soon the tables were turned when the foundations of the Gupta empire were shaken by the Hūṇa invasion[4]

1. Goyal, S.R., *HIG*, pp. 258-261.
2. Cf. the Rithpur plates of Bhavattavarman. For the arguments to show that Prayāga and not Pāṭaliputra was the capital of the Imperial Guptas, see Goyal, *HIG*, pp. 41 ff.
3. For a detailed analysis of all these and other additional arguments cf. Goyal, *HIG*, pp. 258-261.
4. हूणैर्यस्य समागतस्य समरे दोर्भ्यां धरा कंपिता भीमावर्त्त करस्य
—Verse 8, Bhitari Stone Pillar Inscription, Sircar, *SI.*, p. 323.;
आमूल-भग्न-दर्प्पा निर्वचना म्लेच्छदेशेषु
—Junagarh Rock Inscription, Sircar, *ibid*, p. 309.;
cf. also नरपतिभुजगानां मानदर्प्पोत्फणानां प्रतिकृतिगरुडाज्ञां निर्व्विषीं चावकर्त्ता ॥
—Sircar, *ibid.*, p. 308.

and the war of succession broke out between Skandagupta and his rival brothers.[1] Taking advantage of this new situation Narendrasena not only reconquered his lost kingdom but, as is claimed in the Balaghat plates of his son Prithivishena II, imposed his sovereignty over Kosalā, Mekalā and Malava.[2] The Kosalā kingdom of this record was obviously the Nala state. Mekalā, the region situated to the south of the upper courses of Narmada, was ruled over in this period by the Pāṇḍava king Bharatabala, known from the Bamhani inscription.[3] Significantly the Pushyamitras, who according to the Bhitari record created great trouble for Skandagupta,[4] are said to have been the inhabitants of Mekalā in the *Vishṇu Purāṇa*.[5] Thus, the combined testimony of these sources very strongly suggests that Narendrasena paid the Guptas in their own coins and encouraged Bharatabala of the Pāṇḍava dynasty of the Pushyamitras who inhabited Mekalā to carry out raids deep into the Gupta empire.

But from our point of view the most important achievement of Narendrasena was his victory over Mālava Janapada. So far scholars have identified it with Western Mālavā. But

1. क्रमेण बुद्धया निपुणं प्रधार्य ध्यात्वा च कृत्स्नान्गुण-दोप-हेतून् ।
व्यपेत्य सर्व्वान्मनुजेन्द्रपुत्रान् लक्ष्मीः स्वयं यं वरयांचकार ॥ ५॥
—Sircar, *ibid.*, p. 309.
2. कोसलामेकलामालवाधिपतिभिरभ्यर्च्चितशासनस्य
—Mirashi, V.V., *op, cit.*, p. 227.
For details regarding various problems faced by Skandagupta cf., *HIG*, pp. 266-286; 304 ff.
3. Mirashi, *op. cit.*, pp. 228-235.
4. विचलित-कुल-लक्ष्मी-स्तम्भनायोद्यतेन
क्षितितल-शयनीये येन नीता त्रियामा
समुदित-वल-कोशान्पुष्यमित्रांश्च जित्वा
क्षितिप-वरणपीठे स्थापितो वाम-पादः ॥४॥
—Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 322.
5. *Vishṇu Purāṇa*, Wilson's translation, p. 383.
Cf. also Raychaudhuri, H.C., *PHAI*, p. 568; Jagannath, *IHQ*. XXII, pp. 112 ff; Thakur, U., *IHQ*, XXXVII, pp. 279 ff.

now it has been shown that in the fifth century A. D. Malwa was not as yet known as 'Mālava Janapada'; it was known as Avanti. As we have shown in the preceding chapter, the Ajmer-Tonk-Mewar region was known as Mālava Janapada in the third century A. D. It had its capital at Mālavanagara, modern Nagar in the Uniyara Tehsil of the former Jaipur state. The find-spots of the coins and inscriptions of the Mālavas in that area prove this point conclusively. The situation apparently did not change in the fifth and sixth centuries. The *Kāmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana, usually assigned to the Gupta age,[1] clearly distinguishes between Mālava and Avanti Janapadas.[2] In the eyes of Vātsyāyana these were two distinct geographical regions. Secondly, Varāhamihira in his *Bṛihatsaṁhitā*, composed in the sixth century A. D.,[3] makes a similar distinction between Avanti and Mālava regions and places the latter in the northern division.[4] As Varāhamihira himself was an *Āvantika* i.e. a resident of Avanti, this evidence cannot be lightly brushed aside. Thirdly, in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, the date of which, according to Raychaudhuri, is not far removed from the Later Gupta period, Mālava Janapada was associated with *Arbuda* or Abu and was different from Avanti.[5]

Thus it is apparent that at least till the sixth century A.D. Mālava-deśa was regarded as different from Malwa or Avanti. The Vākāṭakas themselves were aware of the difference. For in the Ajanta Cave record, Harisheṇa Vākāṭaka claims to have brought Avanti (and not Mālava) under the spheres of his influence.[6] The combined testimony of the

1. *CA*., p. 324.
2. *Kāmasūtra*, 1.5.22, 24.
3. *CA*, pp. 321-323.
4. Shastri, A.M., *India as Seen in the Bṛihat-Saṁhitā*, pp. 4-8, 70 & 80.
5. सौराष्ट्रावन्त्याभीराश्च शूरा अर्बुदमालवा:
—*Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, 12.1.38 (Gita press edition)
6. स कुन्तलावन्ति-कलिंग-कोसल-त्रिकूट-लाटान्...
—Mirashi, *Vākāṭaka Rājavaṁśa kā Itihāsa tathā Abhilekha*, p. 262.

Balaghat plates[1] of Pṛithivisheṇa II (c. 480 A.D.) and the Ajanta Cave Inscription[2] of Harisheṇa (c. 500 A.D.), when juxtaposed with the contemporary literary evidence noted above, very strongly suggest that the two Vākāṭaka records are referring to two different territories. It may safely be suggested that when Pṛithivisheṇa II Vākāṭaka claimed that the commands of his father Narendrasena were obeyed by the rulers of Mālava Janapada,[3] he was referring not to Malwa of the medieval records but to the Mālava Janapada i.e., Ajmer-Tonk-Mewar region of Rajasthan. During the troubled period of c. 450 to 455 A.D. when Skandagupta's hands were full with the Pushyamitra and Hūṇa invasions and the war of succession, Narendrasena could have proceeded from Mekalā and Bundelkhand (which was ruled by the Uchchakalpas whose king Vyāghra is known to have been a *pādānudhyāta* of Pṛithivisheṇa II)[4] to the Mālava janapada of Rajasthan. Thus this line of enquiry reveals a very important chapter of the history of Rajasthan in the middle of the fifth century A.D. and shows that, at least for some time, this part of the country had to accept the overlordship of the Vākāṭakas of the Deccan. This episode reminds one of the similar adventures of the Rāshṭrakūṭas in Malwa and Rajasthan in the early medieval period.

But the Vākāṭaka domination over the Mālava Janapada of Rajasthan was not destined to last very long. Actually they were not in a position to take advantage of their conquests partly because, like the Sātavāhanas of the earlier period and the Rāshṭrakūṭas of the later epochs, they were too deeply

1. Mirashi, *op. cit.*, pp. 224 ff; *EI.*, IX, pp. 267 ff; XXII, pp. 207 ff.
2. Mirashi, *op. cit.*, pp. 254 ff.
3. ব्दपहृतवंशश्रियः कोसलामेकलामालवाधिपतिभि-
रभ्यर्च्चितशासनस्य

—Balaghat plates. Mirashi, *op. cit.*, p. 227.

4. वाकाटकानां महाराजश्रीपृथिविषेण-
पादानुध्यातो व्याघ्रदेवो-

—Nachane-ki-Talai and Ganj Inscriptions, Mirashi, *op. cit.*, pp. 239 and 241.

involved in the politics of the Deccan to pay much attention to their northern possessions, partly because of the geographical difficulties involved and partly because of their unequal strength in comparison to that of the mighty Guptas who, under Skandagupta, very soon recovered from their temporary difficulties.

From the Mandasor Stone Inscription[1] of Mālava (Vikrama) year 524 (467 A.D.) we learn that a certain king Prabhākara, who defeated the enemies of the Guptas[2] was ruling over western Malwa and obviously, the adjoining regions of southern Rajasthan. Unfortunately the epigraph neither gives the full name of this ruler nor discloses the identity of his family. It is quite possible that he was not at all connected with the 'Aulikara' or 'Varman' family of Mandasor, the last known member of which viz., Bandhuvarman (known date 436 A.D.)[3] or his successor either voluntarily transferred his allegiance from the Guptas to the Vākāṭakas or was forced to accept the overlordship of the latter. In either case it will have to be assumed that Prabhākara, a partisan of the Guptas, succeeded in expelling the aggressive Vākāṭakas from western Malwa and southern Rajasthan. Alternately, it is also possible that the Vākāṭakas ousted the Varmans from western Malwa and southern Rajasthan and Prabhākara (a relation of Bandhuvarman ?) succeeded in re-imposing his authority and Gupta suzerainty over his paternal kingdom. It is also not beyond the bounds of possibility that the reference in the Junagarh *praśasti* of Skandagupta[4] to the hostile kings "who were so many serpents lifting their hoods in pride and arrogance"[5] includes a reference to the rebellious Varmans,

1. Sircar, *SI*, pp. 406 ff.
2. गुप्तान्वयारि-द्रुम-धूमकेतुः ।
   प्रभाकरो भूमिपतिर्यमेनम् ।
   —*ibid.*, p. 408.
3. Mandasor Stone Inscription, Sircar, *ibid.*, pp. 299 ff.
4. Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp 307 ff.
5. Fleet, *CII*, III, p. 62.

gupta, including his struggle against the Hūṇas, were fought and won pretty long before the early months of the Gupta year 126 (455 A.D.).[1] It means that the Hūṇas had invaded but were repulsed during the life time of Kumāragupta I and that Skandagupta defeated them, not as ruling sovereign but as a prince only.[2]

The story of this Hūṇa invasion on the Gupta empire (Rajasthan was included in it at that time) is mainly known from the Bhitari Stone Inscription[3] of Skandagupta. But unfortunately it does not give any detail as to the route adopted by the invaders and the place where the Gupta-Hūṇa struggle took place. It is, therefore, very surprising that many scholars have opined, without any proof whatsoever, that the Hūṇas succeeded in penetrating the very heart of the Gupta empire.[4] As regards Rajasthan[5] itself, it is almost unanimously believed that this region became the victim of the Hūṇa depredations in this period. Upendra Thakur agrees with this general assumption.[6] According to Jagannath[7] the Hūṇas came to India in 455 A.D. via Bolan pass near Quetta and the object of their invasion were Surāshṭra and Malwa from where they advanced towards Rajasthan. He has argued that the Upper Helmand valley was known as Zabulistan, after the term jabula, (or Jabol) the title of the Hūṇa kings. But it has not yet been conclusively proved that the Hūṇas who gave their name to

1. According to the Junagarh inscription Skandagupta had defeated all of his enemies and appointed Parṇadatta as governor of Surāshṭra before the dam of the Sudarśana lake once again burst its embankment in the early part (in the month of Bhādra) of the year 136 (G.E.).
2. *Ibid.*, p. 194-197.
3. Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 323-24.
4. According to R.C. Majumdar 'they advanced still further into the heart of India' (*CA*, p. 26).
   cf. Also, Jagannath, *PIHC*, 1940, p. 60; Sharma, D., *IC*, III, pp. 379 ff. For criticism of this view, vide *JBRS*, XLV, 1959, pp. 118-119; Goyal, *HIG*, pp. 286 ff.
5. *Rajasthan Through the Ages*, Vol. I, p. 61.
6. Thakur, Upendra, *The Hūṇas in India*, pp. 93, 112.
7. Jagannath, *PIHC*, 1958, p. 160 f.

this part of the Helmand valley were the same who invaded India during the reign of Skandagupta. On the other hand, the discovery of two short inscriptions from Uruzgan bearing the name of Mihirakula may indicate that this region was conquered by the Hūnas in the sixth century A.D. The argument that Skandagupta appointed a new governor in Surāshṭra because of the Hūṇa menace[1] is pointless because Skandagupta is said to have appointed new governors in many (lit. 'all') provinces.[2] So far as the special qualities of Parṇadatta, enumerated in the Junagarh record, are concerned they did not have anything to do with Skandagupta's anxiety regarding the possibility of Hūṇa invasion of western India, because obviously, this description is imaginary and was intended to please Purṇadatta, the hero of the epigraph. After all, how could the poet of this *praśasti* living in Surāshṭra know the chain of thought of the Emperor living far away in the imperial capital ? Thus the evidence of the Junagarh inscription does not throw either direct or indirect light on the supposed Hūṇa invasion on Surāshṭra, Malwa and Rajasthan.

Another record which supposedly throws some light on the Hūṇa invasion on Rajasthan is the Mandasor Stone Inscription dated in the Mālava years 493 and 529 (436 and 472 A.D.).[3] According to this epigraph the guild of the silk-weavers got a temple of Sun god built at Daśapura in 436 A.D. By the year 472 A.D. 'in the course of a long time, under *other kings*, the temple was either damaged or had fallen into

1. Sinha, *DKH*, pp. 45-46; Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 309, fn. 6.

2. एवं स जित्वा पृथिवीं समग्रां
भग्नाग्रदर्पा (न्) द्विपतश्च कृत्वा
सर्व्वेषु देशेषु विधाय गोप्तॄन्
संचिन्तयामास बहु-प्रकारम् ॥७॥
—Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 309.

3. Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 290 ff.

regards the damage to the Sun temple some scholars including D.C. Sircar[1] maintain that the inscription merely refers to the fact that the temple had fallen into desrepair—something which was quite possible after a lapse of 36 years. Even if it is to be assumed that it was damaged by invaders, where is the necessity to identify them with the Hūṇas in particular ? As is well known, the Hūṇas who came with Toramāṇa were not hostile to Hinduism and Toramāṇa himself was, as revealed by his coins, a devout worshipper of the Sun god.[2] In view of these facts we find it very difficult to believe that any part of Rajasthan was directly invaded or occupied by the Hūṇas in the middle of the fifth century A.D., though, being a part of the Gupta empire, the north-western frontier of which was invaded by this ferocious tribe, it must have felt indirect strains of this invasion.

Rajasthan and the Aulikara (Vardhana) Empire

During the reign of Budhagupta the hold of the emperor over the various provinces became weaker and the Uchchakalpas transferred their allegiance to the Vākāṭakas, as is evident from the Nachne-ki-Talai and Ganj inscriptions[3] of Vyāghra who claims to have been a *pādānudhyāta* of Pṛithivisheṇa II.[4] In this period the western provinces including West Malwa, Rajasthan and Gujarat also appear to have slipped from the hands of the Guptas. The power which spearheaded this revolt was probably the Vardhana dynasty of Daśapura the kings of which were either descendants of Prabhākara or were responsible for the end of the rule of his dynasty in this region. It is also quite possible that they were the descendants of the earlier Varman family of Mandasor as, like the Varmans,

1. *SI*, p. 306, fn. 2.
2. Thakur, *op. cit.*, p. 262.
3. Mirashi, V.V., *Vākāṭaka Rājavaṁśa kā Itihāsa tathā Abhilekha*, pp. 239 ff.; *Studies in Indology*, Vol. II, pp. 67 ff.
4. वाकाटकानां महाराजश्रीपृथिविषेण-
पादानुध्यातो व्याघ्रदेवो
—Mirashi, V.V., *Vākāṭaka Rājavaṁśa kā Itihāsa tathā Abhilekha*, pp. 239-241.

their family is also said to have been famous for its Aulikara crest.[1]

Until recently the history of West Malwa and South Rajasthan from 467 A.D., the date of Prabhākara,[2] to the year 532 A.D., the date of the Mandasor inscription of Yaśodharman-Vishṇuvardhana, was not known.[3] It was, therefore, believed that Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana was an upstart and that Western Malwa, Rajasthan and Gujarat continued to acknowledge the suzerainty of the Guptas till his rise.[4] But now new epigraphic and literary evidence has come to light on the basis of which the history of Rajasthan and the adjoining *regions in the first half of the sixth century A.D.* may be reconstructed in greater detail. One such inscription is the Mandasor inscription of Mahārāja Gauri of the Mānavayānı family.[5] It refers to one Narendra Ādityavardhana who was apparently the overlord of Gauri. In this record Ādityavardhana is said to have been the conqueror of his enemies whose identity is, however, not disclosed. Another epigraph found from Chhoti Sadri[6] (near Neemuch) gives the year 547 of apparently Mālava Era (490 A.D.) for Gauri, which may be taken as the date of Ādityavardhana also. Neither of *these documents refers to* Budhagupta, the contemporary Gupta emperor. It is, therefore, quite possible, though not finally proved, that Ādityavardhana did not acknowledge their suzerainty.

Ādityavardhana was probably succeeded by Dravyavardhana of Avanti mentioned in *Bṛihatsaṁhitā* of Varāhamihira.[7]

1. प्रख्यात श्रौलिकर-लाञ्छन आत्मवंशो
   येनोदितोदित-पदं गमितो गरीयः ॥६॥
   —*Mandasor Stone Inscription* of Yaśodharman-Mālava year 589, Sircar, *SI*, p. 413.
2. Mandasor Stone Inscription-Mālava year 524.
   —Sircar, *op. cit.* pp. 406 ff.
3. Sircar, *ibid.*, pp. 411 ff.
4. Sinha, B.P., *DKM*, pp. 62 ff.
5. Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 410-411; *EI*, pp. 127-132; XXXIII, pp. 205 ff.
6. *EI*, XXX, pp. 120-127; *IHQ*, XXXIII, pp. 314 ff.
7. *Bṛihatsaṁhitā*, LXXXVI, 1-4, as quoted by Mirashi, *IHQ*, XXXIII, pp. 314-320; *Studies in Indology, Vol.* I, pp. 206-212; *Vol.* II, pp. 180-184.

Aravalli range.[1] And lastly, it is quite possible that the Later Guptas of the Mālava-Janapada which, as we have shown elsewhere, is to be located in the Ajmer-Tonk-Mewar area, accepted the suzerainty of Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana. Thus, almost the whole of Rajasthan, barring perhaps its northern and north-eastern regions, appears to have been under the direct or indirect sway of the Vardhana empire.

The discovery of the two fragmentary inscriptions[2] from Chitorgarh has thrown more light on the relations of Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana with Southern Rajasthan, i.e., Mewar region. These inscriptions have been edited by D.C. Sircar and G.S. Gai. They resemble in script, language and details the Mandasor inscription of Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana of the year 589 M.E. (532 A.D.)[3] They have been assigned the first half of the sixth century A.D. In the Mandasor inscription we find a reference to a family of the the Naigamas,[4] i.e. Vaṇijas or merchants, whose members served as high dignitaries of Yaśodharman--Vishṇuvardhana. The history of this family commenced with one Shashṭhīdatta whose son was Varāhadāsa. The latter was the father or brother of or identical with Ravikīrti. Ravikīrti had three sons: Bhagavaddosha, Abhayadatta, who was the Rājasthānīya of the land bounded by the Vindhya, the Revā, the Pāriyātra and the Sindhu,[5] and Doshakumbha. The last of them had

1. विन्ध्यस्यावन्ध्य-कर्म्मशिखर-तट-पतत्पाण्डुरेवाम्बुराशे-
गोर्लाङ्गूलैः सहेल-प्लुति-नमित-तरो : पारियात्रस्य चाद्रेः ।
आ सिन्धोरन्तरालं निज-शुचि-सचिवाध्यासितानेक-देशं
राजस्थानीय-वृत्त्या सुरगुरुरिव यो वर्ण्णानां भूतये (ऽ) पात् ॥१६॥

—Mandasor Stone Inscription—Mālava year 589. Sircar, *SI*, pp. 415-416.

2. *EI*, XXXIV, pp. 53-58.

3. Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 411-417.

4. According to *Amarakosha* naigama and vaṇija are synonyms: नैगमो वाणिजो वणिक्··· (*Kāṇḍa* II, Vaiśya Varga, 9.78.).

5. Sircar, *op. cit.*, 415-416.

two sons, Dharmadosha, who succeeded Abhayadatta as Rājasthānīya, and Daksha alias Nirdosha, the hero of the inscription who got a well excavated in the memory of his uncle Abhayadatta in the year 589 M.E.(=532 A.D.) during the reign of Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana.

Now, the fragmentary inscriptions from Chitor mentioned above also describe the religious activity of a Rājasthānīya (whose name along with the name of his suzerain has been lost) of Daśapura and Madhyamā, i.e. ancient Madhyamikā in Rajasthan. This Rājasthānīya was the son of Vishṇudatta and the grandson of one Varāha who has been described as best among merchants.[1]

The editors of the inscriptions have rightly suggested that the Varāha of the fragmentary Chitor inscriptions is identical with the Varāhadāsa of the Mandasor inscription, for both of them sprang in the families of famous merchants, bore identical names and belonged to the same period and region.[2]

Thus, it would appear that towards the close of the fifth century or the beginning of the sixth century Gauri of the Mānavayānī family who administered over a part of Mewar and Mandasor region was replaced by the members of the Naigama or Vaṇija family of Varāha or Varāhadāsa. Varāha had at least two sons, Vishṇudatta and Ravikīrti. Perhaps the first to become the Rājasthānīya of that region was Vishṇudatta's son, the hero of Chitor epigraphs whose name is not traceable in the fragmentary inscriptions. On his death, his cousin Abhayadatta, the son of Ravikīrti was appointed the Rājasthānīya. He was succeeded by his nephew Dharmadosha, the son of Doshakumbha.

Thus, the combined testimony of the Chhoti Sadri, the Mandasor and the Chitor documents conclusively proves that southern Rajasthan was ruled over by the viceroys of the Vardhana emperors throughout at least the last decade of the fifth and the early decades of the sixth century A.D. Here it is

1. *The Researcher*, Vol. V-VI, 1964-65, p. 8.
2. *EI*, XXXIV, pp. 55-56.

Panjab is proved by his Kura Stone Inscription,[1] discovery of the coins from this region[2] and the testimony of the *Kuvalaya-mālā* of Udyotanasūri which refers to his rule over Pavvaiyā.[3] His occupation of U.P. is proved by the *Kuvalayamālā* which mentions a certain Harigupta born in the Gupta lineage as his *guru*.[4] This Harigupta has been identified with the Hari-gupta of Pañchāla coins of the sixth century A.D.[5] Further the discovery of Toramāṇa's coins from U.P. and of his seals from Kauśāmbī[6] prove that the whole of modern U.P. was occupied by him. His rule over Bihar and Bengal is evidenced by the *Ārya-mañjuśrī-mūla-kalpa*,[7] the testimony of which is not opposed to any known facts of history.

But what about Rajasthan ? Did the Hūṇas under Tora-māṇa penetrate Rajasthan also ? The evidence at our disposal is not very conclusive. So far no inscription of the Hūṇas themselves has been discovered from this region and the Mandasor Stone Pillar Inscription[8] of Yaśodharman-Vishṇu-vardhana who was the sovereign of the greater part of Rajasthan in the first half of the sixth century A.D. refers to the Hūṇas in a contemptuous way.[9] Further, he claims that even the 'famous king Mihirakula, whose head had never previously been brought into the humility of obeisance to any

1. Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 422-424.
2. Chattopadhyaya, S., *Early History of North India*, p. 194, Narain, A.K., *JNSI*, XXIV, pp. 41 ff.
3. *Kuvalayamālā*, quoted in the *Bhāratiya Vidyā*, II, pt. I., p. 84.
4. तस्स गुरु हरिउत्तो श्रायरियो श्रासि गुत्तावंसाश्रो ।

   --*Kuvalayamālā*, quoted in the *Bhāratīya Vidyā*, II, pt. I, p. 84.
5. Mehta, N.C., *JBORS*. XIV, pp. 28 ff; *IHQ*; XXXIII, pp. 355 ff. Altekar, *Coinage*, pp. 318-321.
6. Sharma, G.R., *Excavations of Kauśāmbī*, 1957-59, p. 15 f.
7. पश्चाद्देशसमायातः हकाराख्यो महानृपः
   प्राचिं दिशिपर्यन्तं गंगातीरमतिष्ठत ॥७६३॥

   —quoted from Jayaswal's *Imperial History of India*.
8. Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 418-420.
9. *Ibid.*, Verse 4.

other save the god Sthāṇu',[1] paid homage to his feet. But there are several indications which suggest that prior to this achievement of Yaśodharman-Vishṇuvardhana, the Hūṇas had succeeded in occupying and devastating large tracts of this part of the country. Firstly, it goes without saying that the Hūṇas were an important factor in the politico-cultural life of Rajasthan in the post-Yaśodharman period. It is not beyond the bounds of possibility that the 'Hūṇa deer' to whom Prabhākaravardhana was 'a lion' dwelt somewhere in the western or northern Rajasthan as it has been enumerated alongwith the king of Sindhu in the *Harshacharita* of Bāṇa,[2] though it is also quite likely that the Hūṇa enemies of the Vardhanas actually ruled somewhere in the mountainous region of the Panjab. In the ninth century there was a Hūṇa-*maṇḍala* situated to the north-east of Malwa which was probably ruled over by Jajjapa.[3] The Hūṇas find mention in the Paramāra[4] and Guhila records also. The Aṭpur inscription of Śaktikumāra dated V. S. 1034 (977 A.D.)[5] records that the king Allaṭa of Guhila family married Hariyādevi, daughter of a Hūṇa king whose name is not given. The *Kānhaḍadeprabandha* of Padmanābha, a medieval work, describes Kānhaḍade as the master of Jalor and overlord of Solankis, Vaghelas, Rāṭhors, Chāvaḍās, Hūṇas, Yādavas, Paramāras and Guhilas.[6] The Western

1. स्थाणोरन्यत्र येन प्रणति-कृपणतां प्रापितं नोत्तमाङ्गं यस्याश्लिष्टो भुजाभ्यां वहति हिमगिरिर्दुर्गशब्दाभिमानम् ।
नीचैस्तेनापि यस्य प्रणति-भुजबलावर्ज्जन-क्लिष्ट-मूर्द्ध्ना चूडा-पुष्पोपहारै-र्म्मिहिरकुलनृपेणार्च्चितं पाद-युग्मम् ॥
—*ibid.*, Verse 6; cf. fn. 4.

2. हूणहरिणकेसरी सिन्धुराजज्वरो गुर्जरप्रजागरो...
—*Harshacharita*, IV.

3. Ganguly, D.C., *History of the Paramāra Dynasty*, p. 40.
4. Thakur, U., *op. cit.*, pp. 209 ff.
5. *IA*, XXXIX, (1910), p. 191; cf. *Bhandarkar's List* No. 35; *JPASB*, VIII, pp. 63 ff.
6. Cf. Sharma, Dasharatha, *JIH*, XXXVIII, p. 106; Thakur, *op. cit.*, p. 220.

with Rajasthan is also quite strong. As is well known, the coins of the Hūṇas have been discovered from a large number of ancient sites of this region.[1] Somewhere in Marwar a hoard consisting of 175 Indo-Sassanian coins belonging to the Sassanian Bust type of Toramāṇa were discovered and examined by Hoernle. The obverse device of these coins bore the king's bust to right and the reverse that of a fire-altar with supporters.[2] Hoernle has assigned all these coins to Toramāṇa.[3] Further a smaller class of copper coins bearing king's head of Sassanian type on the obverse and a Chakra or Sun-wheel on the reverse with the legend Tora or with the name of Zobola or Jabula have been assigned to Toramāṇa. They were discovered in Eastern Panjab and Rajputana.[4] Abaneri, Khoh, Raniyawas, Khejroli, Losal (Distt. Sikar), Sambhar, Desuri, Nagor, Jalor, Chohtan, Sardargarh, Piplaj, Saira-Ranakpur Road, Junakheda(Distt. Jhalawar)and Mewar have also yielded silver and copper coins of the later Hūṇas in large numbers.[5] According to Disalkar the famous Gadhia (Gadhaiyā) coins of the Hūṇas were nothing more than a rude imitation of the Sassanian and local Indian coinage.[6] As many as 3871 Silver and copper Gadhiyā coins of three varieties were found in different sites of Rajputana, they were obviously current in this part of the country from the beginning of the seventh to the close of the eleventh century.[7] Thus it is quite apparent that the Hūṇas were remembered by the subsequent Indian dynasties through their imitations of Hūṇa coinage, the specimens of which are found all over Rajasthan. This was not

1. Hoernle, *PASB*, 1889, p. 229.
2. Thakur, U., *op. cit.*, p. 283.
3. Hoernle, *op. cit.*
4. Thakur, *op. cit.*, pp. 285-86.
5. Parmar, B.S., *The Researcher*, Vols. XII-XIII, 1972-73, pp. 12-13 (App.).
6. *JNSI*, XIII, pp. 66 ff.
7. Reu, B.N., *Coins of Marwar*, preface; p. 8; cf. Webb, *Currencies of the Hindu States of Rajputana*, pp. 4-5; *Bibliography of Indian coins*, pt. I, pp. 88-89; Sharma, G.N., *Rājasthāna kā Itihāsa*, pt. I, pp. 133-34; *Rājasthāna ke Itihāsa ke Srota*, pp. 25-26.

possible if the Hūṇas did not have at least indirect sway over this part of the country for sometime in the post-Gupta period.

The most remarkable and conclusive evidence of the Hūṇa activities in Rajasthan is provided by the Mandasor Stone Pillar Inscription[1] of Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana. As we have noted above Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana established a very extensive empire which included not only West Malwa but almost the whole of Rajasthan and Surāshṭra. As we have shown in the next Chapter even the Maukharis of Kanauj acknowledged the suzerainty of the Vardhana emperor till the middle of the sixth century A.D. They were not, as is generally believed, the feudatories of the Gupta emperors. Now in the undated Stone pillar inscription emperor Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana refers to the Hūṇas in a very contemptuous way[2] claiming that his commands were obeyed in those regions also which were not subjugated even by the Hūṇas.[3] But more than this, he claims that Mihirakula, who had not bowed his head before any one except Lord Sthāṇu (Śiva), was compelled by him to pay homage to his feet.[4] In other words, Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana clearly claims that he vanquished the Hūṇa tyrant who by that time had not tasted the bitter fruit of defeat at the hands of any one else. It is thus obvious that Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana either expelled Mihirakula from those regions of the Vardhana empire which had been conquered by Toramāṇa or successfully repulsed the advance of Mihirakula from the Panjab, Haryana and U.P. into Rajasthan and Malwa. In any case it means that Rajasthan had to face the invasion of Hūṇas under Mihirakula.

The struggle of Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana against Mihirakula poses several problems for historians. Firstly, there is the question of the chronological sequence of the wars which

1. Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 418 ff.
2. Verse, 6.; *ibid.*, p. 419.
3. Verse, 4, *loc. cit.*
4. Verse, 6, *loc. cit.*, fn. 4.

it is also interesting to note that the Mandasor Stone Inscription[1] of 532 A.D. clearly mentions that the ministerial family which was responsible for engraving this record had served the predecessors of Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana for several generations[2] implying thereby that Yaśodharman himself was not an upstart and his career was not as meteoric as is generally believed. We, therefore, agree with Heras[3] and Majumdar[4] who have opined that Mihirakula was defeated first by Yaśodharman earlier than his final defeat at the hands of the Gupta emperor Bālādityarāja. Against this assumption it has been argued that it would imply that Mihirakula re-imposed his authority in the interior of India up to Magadha sometime after the collapse of Yaśodharman's power. But the available evidence does not warrant such an assumption. It is not at all necessary to assume that Yaśodharman broke the power of Mihirakula completely so that the latter had to reimpose his authority in the interior of India. It is equally possible that Yaśodharman merely stopped the advance of Mihirakula into Rajasthan or, what is more likely, expelled the Hūṇas from this region when they advanced as far as Chitrakūṭa (Chitor) probably during their punitive expedition against Bālādityarāja. In other words, the Vardhana-Hūṇa and Gupta-Hūṇa conflicts were the two phases of the same battle though the enemies of the Hūṇas in them were different and their war against the Vardhanas took place somewhat earlier than their war against Narasiṁhagupta Bālāditya. Thus we conclude that there is no inherent difficulty in accepting the testimonies of Yuan-Chwang and Mandasor Stone Pillar Inscription literally.

Let us now try to determine the date of Hūṇa invasion of Rajasthan. In this connection the testimonies of Sung—Yun.[5] Yuann—Chwang[6] and the Mandasor Stone Inscription[7] (date

1. Sircar, *SI*, pp. 411-417.
2. *Loc. cit.*
3. Heras, H., *IHQ*, III, pp. 1 ff.
4. Majumdar, R.C., *NHIP*, pp. 199 ff.
5. Beal, S., *op. cit.*, I. pp. XV, ff. XCIX, ff.
6. Beal, *ibid.*, pp. 168 ff.
7. Sircar, *SI*, pp. 411 ff.

Mālava era 589=532 A.D.) of Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana, when taken together, provide an interesting clue. Sung-Yun, the Chinese traveller, who was in Gandhāra in 520 A.D., informs us that Mihirakula 'had entered on a war with the country of Ki-pin (Kashmir)... and his troops had been already engaged in it for three years'.[1] It means this Kashmir war of the Hūṇa monarch lasted at least from 518 to 520 A.D. It must have been different from the 'treacherous' occupation of Kashmir by him referred to by Yuan Chwang. For, according to Sung Yun, when he visited Gandhāra Mihirakula was the master of India and was trying to conquer Kashmir with his base in Gandhāra while his activities in Kashmir as mentioned by Yuan Chwang took place when he had lost his hold over India proper and had been ousted from Gandhāra by his brother. Later on, Mihirakula occupied Kashmir by treachery, obviously taking advantage of his earlier relation with the Kashmir king. Thus, it is quite apparent that Mihirakula conquered Kashmir militarily shortly after 520 A.D. Now, in his Mandasor Stone Pillar Inscription Yaśodharman states that before his victory over Mihirakula, the latter had falsified the pride of the Himalayas 'on being styled as an inaccessible fortress.'[2] It is obviously a reference to the Kashmir conquest of Mihirakula. We may, therefore, conclude that the Hūṇa invasion of Rajasthan took place some time after 520 A.D. The upper limit of this event cannot go beyond 532 A.D. (the known date of Yaśodharman). We may therefore, conclude that Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana's victory over Mihirakula took place definitely after 520 A.D. but before 532 A.D. It is quite likely that it took place beween 527, the probable date of the Gwalior inscription of Mihira-

1. Beal, *op. cit.*, I, pp. XV. ff; XCIX, ff.
2. स्थाणोरन्यत्र येन प्रणति-कृपणतां प्रापितं नोत्तमाङ्गं-यस्याश्लिष्टो भुजाभ्यां वहति हिमगिरिर्दुर्ग-शब्दाभिमानम् ।
नीचैस्तेनापि यस्य प्रणति-भुजबलावर्ज्जन-क्लिष्टमूर्द्धा-चूडा-पुष्पोपहारै-र्म्मिहिर-कुल-नृपेणार्च्चितं पाद-युग्मम् ॥६॥
—Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 410.

CHAPTER IV

RAJASTHAN IN THE MAUKHARI-VARDHANA AGE

The later Guptas of Rajasthan

The mighty empire of the Aulikara (Vardhana) dynasty of Daśapura, which dominated the political scene of northern India in the second quarter of the sixth century, disintegrated soon after the death of Yaśodharman. No successor of Yaśodharman is definitely known to history. According to some scholars, he was succeeded by Mahārājādhirāja Dravyavardhana whose work on *śakunas* was utilised by Varāhamihira. Although this is not altogether impossible, it appears unlikely that Varāhamihira who died in 587 A.D.[1] could use in his *Bṛhatsaṁhitā* a work composed in the middle of the sixth century. We, therefore, feel that Dravyavardhana ruled earlier, and not later than Yaśodharman.[2] However, even if Dravyavardhana was not the successor of Yaśodharman it may easily be assumed that the latter was succeeded by either his son or brother or some one else, who is not known to us so far. But this unknown monarch could have hardly ruled for an appreciably long time, since the Vardhanas are not known to have played any role whatsoever in the struggle of the imperial supremacy which took place between the Later Guptas and the Maukharis. As a matter of fact in the southern part of central Rajasthan, the Vardhanas appear to have been supplanted by the Later Guptas themselves. We support the

1. Sengupta, PC., *Ancient Indian Chronology*, p. 276. According to Āmarāja, the commentator of Brahmagupta's *Khaṇḍakhādyaka*, Varāhamihira died in the Śaka year 509 (=587 A.D.) while according to Alberuni the *Pañchasiddhāntikā* of Varāhamihira was composed in 505 A.D. (cf. Shastri, A.M., *India as Seen in the Bṛhatsaṁhitā*, pp. 4 ff.).
2. According to V.V. Mirashi (*PICC*, 1957 pp. 101-106 : *IHQ*, XXXIII, pp. 314-20) Dravyavardhana was the predecessor, probably father, of Yaśodharman.

contention that the Later Gupta dynasty originally belonged to the Mālava janapada of Rajasthan and initially owed allegiance to the Vardhana dynasty of Yaśodharman, though later on, it became independent and tried to step into the shoes of the Vardhanas as an imperial power. It led to the beginning of its long-drawn struggle against the Maukharis of Kanauj which has been so vividly described in the Aphsad inscription of Ādityasena.[1] But before we discuss the career of the Later Guptas in detail it is essential to discuss the problem of their original home in brief in order to determine their association with Rajasthan.

The location of the original home of the Later Guptas is one of the most controversial problems of ancient Indian history. The early history of this dynasty is known only from its later inscriptions of the post-Harsha period which have been discovered from Magadha, namely the Aphsad,[2] Shahpur[3] and Mandor[4] inscriptions of Ādityasena, the Magraon[5] and Kauleśvarī Hill inscription of Vishṇugupta[6] and the Deo-Baranark inscription of Jīvitagupta II.[7] The find-spots of these records make it certain that from Ādityasena down to Jīvitagupta II Magadha formed the core of the Later Gupta kingdom. It naturally leads to the presumption that the predecessors of Ādityasena were the rulers of the same region unless it can be otherwise proved. Therefore, J.F. Fleet,[8] R.C. Majumdar,[9] R.D. Banerji,[10] B.P. Sinha[11] and many others assume that the Later Gupta dynasty originated in Magadha. It has also been argued by these historians that the victories of Jīvitagupta I (which we shall discuss below) over some Himalayan tribes and over his enemies living on the sea-shore as well as the

1. Fleet, *CII*, III, pp. 200 ff.
2. *Ibid.*, pp. 200 ff.
3. *Ibid.*, pp. 208 ff.
4. *Ibid.*, pp. 211 ff.
5. *EI*, XXIV, pp. 26 ff.
6. *EI*, XXX, 78.ff.
7. Fleet, *op. cit.*, pp. 213 ff.
8. *Ibid.*, Intro., p. 4.
9. *NHIP*, pp. 208-9.
10. *JBORS*, XIV, p. 254.
11. *DKM*, pp. 113 ff.

have founded a city named Mālavanagara in this area. Thus till the early Gupta period the Mālava janapada denoted Ajmer-Tonk-Mewar area of Rajasthan and not western Malwa which became famous by this name in the Paramāra period.

(ii) The *Kāmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana usually assigned to the Gupta age, quite clearly differentiates between Avanti (western Malwa) and Mālava janapada.[1] It is only his commentator Yaśodhara who states that Avanti denoted western Malwa, evidently here Yaśodhara has explained the statement of the *Kāmasūtra* in the light of the situation prevailing in his own days ; it has nothing to do with the situation of the Gupta age when the *Kāmasūtra* was composed.

(iii) The evidence of Vātsyāyana is supported by the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*[2] in which Mālava country is associated with Arbuda or Abu and is distinguished from Avanti.

(iv) Varāhamihara, who flourished in the sixth century A.D. and died in 587 A.D. (i.e. in the age of the Later Guptas themselves), in his *Bṛhatsaṁhitā* also distinguishes between Mālava and Avanti *deśas* and places the former in the northern division.[3] As Varāhamihira was himself an inhabitant of Avanti[4] his testimony cannot be lightly brushed aside.

From these arguments given by Goyal it is apparent that in the sixth century A.D. when the Later Guptas flourished, Mālava janapada was located in Rajasthan and Avanti had not acquired this name. Even Yuan Chwang was aware of this difference between the kingdoms of Ujjayinī and Mo-la-po, though his description[5] leaves the location of the latter somewhat uncertain.

1. *Kāmasūtra*, 2.5.22 and 24.
2. *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, 12.1.38 (Gita Press edition).
3. Shastri, A.M., *India as seen in the Bṛhatsaṁhitā*, pp. 70 and 80.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 18.
5. Watters, T., *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*, II, pp. 242 and 250.

The conclusion that the Mālava janapada of the Later Guptas should be located in the Ajmer-Tonk-Mewar area of Rajasthan is strongly corroborated by the history of this dynasty. As is quite well-known, the history of the Later Gupta dynasty was intimately connected with the history of the Maukharis of Kanauj. During the first phase of their history the Later Guptas and Maukharis were on friendly terms with each other and at least once, and probably twice, they cemented their friendship with the bond of matrimonial alliance. In the Later Gupta dynasty Kṛishṇagupta, the founder of the family, was succeeded in turn by Harshagupta, Jīvitagupta I, Kumāragupta, Dāmodargupta and Mahāsenagupta, the father of Mādhavagupta, while in the Maukharī family the successors of Harivarman, the first king of the dynasty, were Ādityavarman, Īśvarvarman, Īśānavarman, Śarvavarman, Avantivarman, and Grahavarman, the brother-in-law of Harsha. Now from the Maukhari records we learn that Ādityavarman, the second Maukhari king, had Harshaguptā as his queen who was evidently the sister of Harshagupta, the second Later Gupta ruler.[1] Īśvaravarman, the son of Ādityavarman was also married to a Gupta princess named Upaguptā, whose Later Gupta origin is however uncertain.[2] In any case these facts tend to indicate that the early kings of both these dynasties were on friendly terms with each other.

The friendly relations of both the royal houses were also political in nature. This becomes evident by an analysis of their respective achievements against the background of contemporary political condition. It is generally believed that the early members of these royal houses owed allegiance to the imperial Guptas.[3] We beg to differ; for the period when these

1. Fleet *CII*, III, 220.
2. *Loc. cit.* Some scholars believe that Upaguptā was the sister of Vishṇugupta Chandrāditya (Vishṇu=Upendra), the last Gupta emperor, while others have suggested that she was a Later Gupta princess. Both these suggestions are, however, conjectural.
3. *CA*, p. 67 and 72.

dynasties started their political career Malwa, Rajasthan and adjoining region of U.P. were dominated by the Aulikaras of Mandasor and Madhyamikā and not by the imperial Guptas. This fact, alongwith our suggestion that the Later Guptas originally belonged to Rajasthan, makes a reconstruction of the history of these dynasties imperative. As is well-known, the fourth member of the Maukhari dynasty, namely, Īśānavarman fought a war against Kumāragupta, the fourth member of the Later Gupta dynasty.[1] And as Īśānavarman was ruling in 554 A.D., the date of his Haraha record, the commencement of the political career of both the dynasties may be placed in c. 490 A.D. It was exactly the period when the imperial Aulikara or Vardhana dynasty of Western Malwa and Southern Rajasthan acquired imperial status, for, as we have seen, the first known date of this dynasty is 490 A.D., known from a Mandasor inscription of Mahārāja Gauri, a feudatory of Ādityavardhana.[2] It makes it quite likely that these two dynasties were brought into existence as their own feudatories by the Vardhana emperors. This possibility is strengthened by the subsequent history of these two dynasties. As we have noted above, according to the Aphsad record Jīvitagupta I, the third king of the Later Gupta dynasty, defeated his enemies who are described as living in the Himalayas and on the sea-shore.[3] In the same way the Jaunpur record informs us that Īśvaravarman,[4] the third Maukhari ruler who must have been a contemporary of Jīvitagupta I, acquired some success in the imalayan region while the Harsha record states that Īśānaarman, the son of Īśvaravarman, defeated, among others, the Gauḍas, who inhabited the coastal regions of Bengal, *before* he ascended the throne, i.e. in the reign of his father Īśvaravarman himself. Now, according to generally accepted chronology based on the known date of Īśvaravarman (554 A.D.), Īśvaravarman and his Later Gupta contemporary Jīvitagupta I must have ruled in the third and the fourth decades of the

1. Fleet, *CII*, III, pp. 200 ff.
2. Sircar, *SI*, pp. 410-11.
3. Fleet, pp. 202-203.
4. *Ibid.*, pp. 228 ff.

sixth century A.D. Therefore, they must have been contemporaries of Yaśodharman who claims that the chieftains upto the mountain Mahendra, the lands at the foot of which are impenetrable through the groves of palmyra trees, and upto the Himalayas bowed down before his feet.[1] As he is known to have fought a war on the banks of the river Lauhitya,[2] he must have conquered Bengal also. Thus Jīvitagupta I, Īśvaravarman and Yaśodharman were not only contemporaries, some of their most remarkable achievements were identical. In the light of this fact the current theory that the Maukharis and the Later Guptas were feudatories of the imperial Guptas till the middle of the sixth century A.D. appears to be erroneous. They must now be regarded as the feudatories of the Vardhana emperors and their achievements, described above, must have been the result of their participation in the campaigns of their overlord.

Thus the early Maukharis were also the feudatories of the Vardhanas. There is nothing improbable in this suggestion because Kanauj, the seat of the Maukhari principality, was not very far away from Daśapura and Ujjayanī; at any rate it was situated on the route from Daśapura to Kāmarūpa which Yaśodharman must have followed when he went to fight a war on the banks of Lauhitya. It also explains better the close relationship of the Later Gupta and Maukhari dynasties in the earlier phase of their history. Being the feudatories of the same imperial house it was quite natural for them to have been friendly to each other and to have contracted a matrimonial alliance when Harshaguptā, the sister of the second king of the Later Gupta dynasty, Harshagupta, was married to Ādityavarman, the second ruler of the Maukhari royal house. At that time they had no bone of contention between them. These facts made it quite natural for Jīvitagupta I and Īśvaravarman to participate jointly in the campaigns of their overlord.

Age of the Maukhari Domination

The political situation in India entirely changed in the

1. Sircar, D.C., *SI*, p. 419.
2. *Ibid.*

middle of the sixth c. A.D. when the empire of the house of Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana in western India and the imperial Gupta empire in the eastern part of the country ceased to exist. The political vacuum created by the disappearance of these empires could not be filled for sometime by any paramount authority though several regional powers tried to step into the shoes of the Aulikaras and the Guptas. The most important power which emerged in eastern India was that of the Gauḍas, who reached the zenith of their power during the reign of Śaśāṅka who had already conquered the region extending upto Kanauj when Grahavarman, the last Maukhari emperor was murdered in 606 A D.[1] As we shall see, the Later Guptas of the Mālava janapada of Rajasthan had also tc accept his overlordship foı the time being during the reign of Mahāsenagupta. But before we discuss the career of Mahāsenagupta and his relationship with Śaśāṅka, let us try to reconstruct the history of former's dynasty after Jīvitagupta I.

During the fourth generation of the Later Gupta and Maukhari royal houses (c. 540-560 A.D.) the Aulikara empire of the house of Yaśodharman finally collapsed. In this generation the ruler of the Later Gupta family was Kumāragupta, the son of Jīvitagupta I while in the Maukhari house Īśvaravarman was succeeded by his son Īśānavarman. Both these monarchs, Kumāragupta and Īśānavarman, were ambitious and wanted to exploit the opportunity created by the fall f the Aulikara empire. The power and importance of their respective families was already established by their predecessors who conquered distant enemies either separately or jointly, either in their independent capacity or as the feudatories of their overlord. To us it appears that the Maukharis were earlier to throw off the yoke of the Aulikara overlordship and make an attempt for the acquisition of imperial status. It is suggested by the Jaunpur inscription, according to which Īśvaravarman was successful in extinguishing "a spark of fire that

1. As Grahavarman was murdered only a short while before the accession of Harshavardhana, which took place in 606 A.D., the death of Grahavarman may be placel in th: same year.

had come by the road from (the city of) Dhārā".[1] It is quite likely that here reference is made to the probable expedition of the Aulikaras sent to suppress the rebellion of the Maukharis. Dhārā was an important city of western Malwa and it might have been the base of operations of the Aulikaras against the Maukharis. Though some scholars interpret this statement of the Jaunpur inscription differently,[2] the above interpretation given by J.F. Fleet is in consonance with the contemporary political situation and may, therefore, be accepted as correct.

The success of *Ī*śvaravarman against the punitive expedition of the Aulikaras was probably the final act of the drama of the collapse of the Aulikara empire. Very soon the last vestiges of the Aulikara rule disappeared and the Later Guptas and Maukharis were struggling with each other for imperial status. Their conflict is vividly described in the Aphsad inscription of Ādityasena. According to it Kumāragupta, the son of Jīvitagupta I, playing the part of the mountain Mahendra, "quickly churned that formidable milk ocean, the cause of the attainment of fortune, which was the army of the glorious *Ī*śānavarman, a very moon among kings, (*and*) which had for (*its*) spreading rows of waves the plantain trees that were wantonly shaken to and fro by the roaring wind (*caused by the marching of the troops*), (*and*) had (*its*) rocks, that were the ponderous and mighty rutting elephants (*of the forces*), whirled round and round by the masses of water that were the rising dust (*stirred up by the soldiers*). Cherishing heroism and adherence to the truth, (*even*) in (*the possession of*) wealth, he went to Prayāga ; (*and there*), honourably decorated with flowers, plunged into a fire (*kindled*) with dry cow-dung cakes, as if (*simply plunging to bathe*) in water."[3] The outcome of this war

1. Fleet, *CII*, III, pp. 228 ff.
2. According to Basak in this passage the word *dhārā* stands for the edge of sword (*HNEI*, p. 109). D.C. Sircar follows him closely (*JIH*, XLII, pp. 127 ff). Cf. U.N. Roy, *Studies in Indian History and Civilization.*
3. Fleet, p. 206.

has been a matter of great controvercy among historians. Majumdar,[1] Tripathi[2] and Sinha[3] believed that Kumāragupta was victorious while Mookerji[4] and Ray[5] ascribe victory to *Ī*śānavarman. We agree with the second view. The theory of Majumdar and his followers is based upon the erroneous assumption that a defeat of Kumāragupta could not be mentioned in an inscription of his successors. But instances are not unknown in which the defeat of a monarch is mentioned in his own inscriptions or in the inscriptions of his successors. For example in the Doobi plate[6] of Bhāskaravarman it has been said that he, alongwith his brother Supratishṭhitavarman, was defeated and captured by a Gauḍa king.[7] Here it is interesting to note that, while describing the war of Kumāragupta and *Ī*śānavarman, the Aphsad record lays more emphasis on the military might of *Ī*śānavarman than even on the personal valour of Kumāragupta. Actually it refers to the Maukhari army as the cause of the attainment of *Lakshmī* (Vijayalakshmī) and describes *Ī*śānavarman as "a very moon among kings". When one finds that the author of the Aphsad inscription eulogises Iśānavarman and his army in the fashion and does not make any explicit reference to the victory of Kumāragupta, the conclusion can hardly be avoided that the poet avoided mentioning the defeat of Ādityasena's ancestor without taking recourse to falsehood.

The struggle of Kumāragupta and *Ī*śānavarman is rearded as the first phase of the Later Gupta-Maukhari rivalry. For according to the Aphsad inscription "Breaking up the proudly stepping array of mighty elephants, belonging to the Maukhari, which had thrown aloft in battle the troops of the Hūṇas (*in order to trample them to death*)", Dāmodaragupta, the son of Kumāragupta, "became unconscious (*and expired in the*

1. *CA*, p. 72.
2. *History of Kanauj*, p. 43.
3. *DKM*, pp. 168-69.
4. *Harsha*, pp. 54-55.
5. Quoted in *DKM*, p. 168.
6. *EI*, XXX, pp. 288 ff.
7. *Loc. cit.*, cf. *DKM*, p. 168 fn. 3.

first ;) (*and then, waking again in heaven*) (*and*) making a choice among the women of the gods, saying (*this one or that*) belongs to me, he was revived by the pleasing touch of the water-lilies that were their hands."[1]

Like the description of Īśānavarman-Kumāragupta struggle the present description of Dāmodaragupta's war against the Maukhari is also not free from difficulties of interpretation. The first problem is posed by the fate of Dāmodaragupta—whether he died fighting or became unconscious only ? K.C. Chattopadhyaya believed that Dāmodaragupta did not die in the battle-field. According to him the Later Gupta king only fell unconscious and after recovering from unconsciousness lived for sometime more.[2] But most of the other scholars accept the translation of Fleet as given above. The question of the identity of the victorious party has also been quite controversial. Ray,[3] Basak[4] and Tripathi[5] give the credit of victory to Maukharis while Raychaudhuri,[6] Majumdar,[7] Aravamutham[8] and Sinha[9] believe that it was a case of posthumous victory for Dāmodaragupta. As regards the identity of the Maukhari adversary of Dāmodaragupta, whose name has not been revealed by the Aphsad record, Saletore[10] believes that he was Sūryavarman, the son of Īśānavarman known from the Harsha inscription[11] while Sinha[12] and many others[13] think that Dāmodaragupta fought against Śarvavarman, another son

1. Fleet, *op. cit.*, p. 206.
2. *D.R. Bhandarkar, Volume*, pp. 180-82.
3. *Calcutta Review*, 1928, pp. 201 ff.
4. *HNEI*, p. 115.
5. *History of Kanauj*, pp. 44-45.
6. *PHAI*, p. 512.
7. *History of Bengal*, Vol. I. p. 57.
8. *The Kaveri, the Maukhari and the Sangam Age*, p. 92
9. *DKM*, pp. 173-75.
10. *Life in the Gupta Age*, p. 53.
11. Sircar, *SI*, pp. 385 ff.
12. *DKM*, 172-73.
13. Cf. Aravamutham, *op. cit.*, p. 92; Pires, E.A., *The Maukharis*, pp. 88 f.

and successor of Īśānavarman. We, however, feel that the Later Gupta and Maukharis fought only one war which took place during the reign of Kumāragupta and Īśānavarman in which the Later Guptas were defeated and that Dāmodaragupta, the son of Kumāragupta lost his life. It explains the reference to the adversary of Dāmodaragupta as merely "the Maukhari." Having mentioned *Īśānavarman* in the earlier verse, the author of the epigraph obviously felt it unnecessary to give his name once again. It also provides us a sound reason for the suicide of Kumāragupta; he was not only defeated but also lost his son. He, therefore, gave up his life at Prayāga. Another instance of similar nature is provided by the *ĀMMK* according to which Bālāditya (Narasiṁhagupta Bālāditya I) put an end to his life when his son died a premature death.[1] Thus the above suggestion explains all the known facts of Later Gupta-Maukhari conflict satisfactorily. The Maukhari victory over the Later Guptas is further proved by the subsequent history of the two dynasties. In the second half of the sixth century the Maukharis ruled over a vast empire extending at least upto Magadha in the east,[2] eastern Panjab in the west,[3] Kālañjara Maṇḍala in the south[4] and, as we have seen, the Mālava janapada of Rajasthan in the south-west.

1. *Summaries of the Papers of the Indian History Congress*, Chandigarh Session (1973).
2. Several seals of the Maukharis were found at Nālandā (*EI*, XXI, p. 73 and XXIV, pp. 224). Sūryavarman is mentioned in the Sirpur *praśasti* of Mahāśivagupta as belonging to the family which was famous for its hold over Magadha (*EI*, XI, p. 184 f.). The Deo-Barnark inscription of Jīvitagupta II refers to the gifts of land made by Śarvavarman and Avantivarman in Magadha (Fleet, *CII*, III, pp. 213 ff.).
3. The Nirmand inscription of Samudrasena refers to Śarvavarman (Fleet, *Ibid.*, pp. 286 ff.). As the ancestors of Prabhākaravardhana of Thanesar were only Mahārājas they must have been subordinate to the Maukharis.
4. The Barah Copper Plate Inscription of Mihirabhoja Pratīhāra (Pandey, R.B., *Historical and Literary Inscription*, p. 167) refers to Śarvavarman's grant in the Kālañjara Maṇḍala. A seal of Śarvavarman was found at Asirgadh (Fleet, *op. cit.*, pp. 219 ff.).

The Later Guptas obviously had to accept the overlordship of the Maukharis. Many scholars believe that as Kumāragupta committed religious suicide at Prayāga, this city must have been included in his kingdom.[1] But they forget that the alternative that he was defeated by the Maukharis makes Prayāga quite accessible to him, because after his submission to the Maukharis he could easily go to any part of the Maukhari empire.

The emergence of the Maukharis as an imperial power and the relegation of the Later Guptas to an insignificant position at least for the time being is further proved by the fact that from the time of Īśānavarman onwards the Maukharis adopted the imperial title of Mahārājādhirāja[2] while the Later Guptas adopted it for the first time during the reign of Ādityasena i.e. in the post-Harsha period.[3] Moreover, the Maukharis are known to have issued their own coinage[4] while the coins of the Later Guptas are not known so far. The greatness of the Maukharis is also reflected in the *Harshacharita* of Bāna where the Maukhari royal house is said to have been 'as venerable as the foot-prints of the lord Śiva'.[5] Even the Later Gupta records which do not claim any imperial title for the predecessors of Ādityasena refer to Śarvavarman (c. 560-580 A D.) and Avantivarman (c. 580-605 A.D.) as Parameśvaras.[6] In the records of many other dynasties the Maukharis have been mentioned respectfully. Thus it is apparent that while the whole greatness of the Later Gupta rulers of the sixth century (the location of whose kingdom itself is a matter of controversy) depends upon their description in the Aphsad record of Ādityasena, the greatness of the Maukharis of the same period

1. Sinha, B.P., *DKM*, pp. 169-70.
2. Fleet, *op.cit.*, 219 ff.
3. *Ibid.*, pp. 213 ff.
4. *DKM*, pp. 427 ff.
5. धरणीधराणां च मूर्ध्नि स्थितो माहेश्वरः पादन्यास इव सकलभुवननम-स्कृतो मौखरो वंशः।

—*Harshacharita*, IV.

6. Fleet, *op. cit.*, pp. 213 ff.

is proved by the vastness of their empire, their coinage, contemporary epigraphs, literary references and their respectful mention in the records of other dynasties.

Age of the Gauḍa Supremacy

From the above discussion it is apparent that Maukharis were the overlords of the Later Guptas till the third quarter of the sixth century A.D. During the last years of the reign of Mahāsenagupta, the situation took a new turn. As we mentioned earlier, towards the close of the sixth century A.D., the Gauḍas became dominant in eastern India and Śaśāṅka, their redoubtable king, established an extensive empire.[1] The known dates of Śaśāṅka are 606 A.D. (as according to the *Harshacharita* he killed Rājyavardhana[2] very shortly before the accession of Harsha which took place in 606 A.D.) and 619 A.D. (the date given in his Ganjam copper plates).[3] By the year 606 A.D. he had apparently established a vast empire extending from Gauḍa to Kanauj. He must, therefore, have started his career much earlier, for in the initial stage of his political life he was merely a Mahāsāmanta.[4] He was thus a junior contemporary of Mahāsenagupta whose son Mādhavagupta was almost exact contemporary of Harsha.[5] This relative chronology provides better explanation to some of the interesting facts of the history of this period.[6] As the Maukharis had thwarted the imperial ambitions of the Later Guptas, it was quite natural for the latter to cultivate friendly relations with the Gauḍas. In this situation it is quite likely that Mahāsena-

1. For a detailed history of Śaśāṅka, vide, Sinha, B.P., *DKM*, pp. 225-262; Majumdar, R.C., *History of Bengal*, Vol. I, pp. 59-76; *CA*, pp. 78-81.
2. *Harshacarita*, VI.
3. *EI*, VI, pp. 143 ff.
4. Vide his Rohtasgadh seal (Fleet, *op. cit.*, p. 283) in which he has been mentioned only as a Mahāsāmanta.
5. In his early years Mādhavagupta was made a companion of Harsha and he acquired the throne of Magadha either as a feudatory of Harsha during the last years of the reign of the latter or as an independent king after the death of the Vardhana emperor.
6. Goyal, S.R., *loc. cit.*

gupta had accepted the overlordship of Śaśāṅka who happens to be his contemporary. Further we know that Devagupta, the Mālava king, was an ally of Śaśāṅka and had helped him in his Kanauj campaign.[1] Therefore, it may be regarded as within the bounds of possibilities that some sort of political dealings existed between Mahāsenagupta and Śaśāṅka also.

In the light of these facts the evidence of Doobi copper plates of Bhāskaravarman[2] assumes great significance. According to these plates when Bhāskaravarman was merely a prince, i.e. in the period immediately before 606 A.D. (for according to the *Harshacharita* Bhāskaravarman was already on the throne when Harsha started his reign in that year), a king of Gauḍa invaded Kāmarūpa, fought a successful battle on the banks of Lauhitya and captured young Bhāskara and his elder brother Supratishṭhita, the sons of Susthitavarman.[3] The name of this Gauḍa king is not mentioned in this record but, as is evident from the contemporary political situation, he was most likely Śaśāṅka himself.[4] Now the Aphsad inscription of Ādityasena, also informs us that Mahāsenagupta, who was, as we have just seen, a senior contemporary of Śasāṅka, also fought a war on the banks of Lauhitya against Susthitavarman, the Kāmarūpa king.[5] In the light of the possibility of the Gauḍa-Later Gupta dealings, suggested above, the assumption of Goyal that Mahāsenagupta must have fought this war as a feudatory of Śaśāṅka appears to be quite convincing.[6] This logical interpretation of the Lauhitya war of Mahāsenagupta imparts a new dimension to the contemporary history. In particular, it throws a flood of light on the history of Rajasthan in this period and proves that sometime towards the close of the sixth century A.D., the Later Guptas of the Mālava janapada, of Rajasthan threw off the yoke of the Maukhari overlordship and became subordinate to the Gauḍa supremacy.

1. *DKM*, p. 246; *CA*; p. 79.
2. *EI*, XXX, p. 287.
3. *Loc. cit.*
4. Cf. *CA*, p. 92.
5. Fleet, *CII*, III, p. 206.
6. Goyal, S.R., *loc. cit.*

The history of the Later Guptas of Rajasthan after Mahāsenagupta is not very clear. But there are two facts which can hardly be doubted. Firstly, according to the *Harshacharita* Kumāragupta and Mādhavagupta, whom Bāṇa describes as the sons of the Mālavarāja, took shelter with Prabhākaravardhana of Thanesar,[1] whose mother Mahāsenaguptā was apparently the sister of Mahāsenagupta. Secondly, from the combined testimony of the *Harshacharita* and the Banskheda inscription of Harsha[2] we learn that Devagupta, the ruler of Malwa, was an ally of Śaśāṅka and was responsible for the murder of Grahavarman, though he was himself defeated by Rājyavardhana II, the elder brother of Harsha.[3] From these facts it has been rightly concluded that Devagupta was a relative of Mahāsenagupta and that he succeeded in capturing the Mālava throne at the cost of Kumāragupta and Mādhavagupta.[4] He must have been helped in his designs by the Gauḍa emperor Śaśāṅka though he met a pre-mature death at the hands of Rājyavardhana II.[5] With him the history of the Later Gupta dynasty of the Mālava janapada comes to a close; it regained royal status once again in the later half of the seventh century A.D. but this time they ruled in Magadha and not in Rajasthan.

The Pratīhāras of Māṇḍavyapura

The history of the Pratīhāras of Māṇḍavyapura, modern Mandor (five miles to the north of Jodhpur), is known only from the Jodhpur inscription of Bāuka dated V.S. 894 (837 A.D.)[6] and the five Ghatiyala inscriptions of his younger brother Kakkuka, three of which are dated in the year 918 V.S. (861 A.D.).[7] According to these documents Harichandra, the

1. *Harshacharita*, IV.
2. Pandey, R.B., *op. cit.*, pp. 145 ff.; *EI*, IV, pp. 208-11.
3. *DKM*, pp. 246-47; *CA*, p. 74.
4. *DMK*, p. 213.
5. *Ibid.*, pp. 246 ff.
6. *EI*, XVIII, pp. 87-99.
7. *EI*, IX, pp. 277-281; *JRAS*, 1895, pp. 513-521. Of these five inscriptions, four are in Sanskrit and one in Prakrit.

founder of this family and his successors ruled before the kings of these inscriptions. Therefore, it is generally believed that Harichandra flourished in the middle of the sixth century A.D.[1] Harichandra was a *Brāhmaṇa* by caste and belonged to the family of Pratīhāras. Now, there was another family of the Pratīhāras which ruled, at least from the time of Nāgabhaṭa II, with Kanauj as its capital. It is specifically called a family of Gurjara origin, though what the term 'Gurjara' denotes is a controversial question.[2] In any case it is certain that it was a Gurjara-Pratīhāra family whatever the significance of the term Gurjara might have been. A third family, which is said to have been of Gurjara extraction, ruled over Lāṭa (southern Gujarat) with Nāndīpurī as its capital. It was to this family that Dadda, who saved the Valabhī king from the anger of Harshavardhana, belonged.[3] According to the generally accepted view all the families were related with each other and all of them are usually put under the same category viz. 'the Gurjara-Pratīhāras'. The assumption finds some support from the fact that several names adopted by the royal houses of the Māṇḍavyapura and Kanauj are common[4] and at least one is found both in the families of Māṇḍavyapura and Lāṭa[5] (though no name is common in the families of Kanauj and Lāṭa). Further, according to R.C. Majumdar[6] the Pratīhāras of Māṇḍavyapura, like the Pratīhāras of Kanauj, refer to Lakshmaṇa as

1. *EI*, XVIII, pp. 87 ff.; *CA*, p. 65.
2. According to D.R. Bhandarkar (*Foreign Elements in the Hindu Population IA*, XL, 1911, pp. 3-37. re-printed in the *JAIH*, Vol. I, pt. 1-2, 1967-68, pp. 267-328) and R.C. Majumdar (*JDL*, p. 1 ff; *EI*, XVIII, pp. 87 ff) 'Gurjara' was the name of a foreign tribe which entered India in the post-Gupta period while D. Sharma, (*RTA*, I, pp. 472 ff) and many others believe that 'Gurjara' is a geographical term and all the inhabitants of the Gurjara region were called Gurjaras whatever their caste affiliations might have been.
3. *CA*, pp. 66 f, 104 f.
4. *Viz*, Nāgabhaṭa and Kakkuka.
5. *Viz*. Dadda.
6. *EI*, XVIII, pp. 87 ff.

their earliest ancestor. But it has not been properly emphasised so far that while the Pratīhāras of Māṇḍavyapura nowhere use the term 'Gurjara' for themselves, the Gurjaras of Nāndipurī have not used the term 'Pratīhāra' for their dynasty in any of their inscriptions. Secondly, though Lakshmaṇa, the younger brother of Rāma, has been mentioned in the invocatory verses of the documents of the Pratīhāras of Māṇḍavyapura and the imperial Pratīhāras both, it is also a fact that the imperial Pratīhāras are everywhere described as the Kshatriyas of the Solar dynasty, the Raghuvaṁśīs and Raghukulachuḍāmaṇis,[1] the Pratīhāras of Mandor trace their descent from Harichandra, a Brāhmaṇa. It were the sons born to his Kshatriya wife Bhadrā who for the first time acquired Kshatriya status in that family.[2] Further, as shown by Dasharatha Sharma, the imperial Pratīhāras refer to Lakshmaṇa as their own ancestor while the Pratīhāras of Māṇḍavyapura refer to him simply because he had made the profession of the Pratīhāras illustrious by performing the duties of a door-keeper.[3] It is evident, there-

1. Sharma, D., *RTA*, I, p. 215 and fn. 1; pp. 472 ff.
2. *EI*, XVIII, pp. 87 ff.
3. All that the Jodhpur inscription of Bāuka states about the connection of Harichandra's family with Lakshmaṇa is the following :—

स्वभ्रात्रा रामभद्रस्य प्रातिहार्यं कृतं यतः ।
श्रीप्रतीहारवंशोयमतश्चोन्नतिमाप्नुयात् ॥

(Verse 4. Pandey, R.B., *Historical and Literary Inscriptions*, p. 159).

R.C. Majumdar (*EI*, XVIII, pp. 95, 97) translates this verse thus: "Inasmuch as the very brother of Rāmabhadra performed the duty of door-keeper (*pratīhāra*) this illustrious clan came to be known as Pratīhāras. May it prosper." But according to Dasharatha Sharma (*RTA*, I, p. 475) this is a case of mistranslation. It gives the impression that the Pratīhāras of Mandor regarded themselves as the descendants of Lakshmaṇa. Sharma translates this verse thus: "Inasmuch as the very brother of Rāmabhadra performed the duty of door-keeper (*pratīhāra*), may this illustrious Pratīhāra family attain eminence" (*ibid.*). According to this translation the author of the inscription merely expresses the desire that the Pratīhāra family may attain greatness as once Rāma's brother Lakshmaṇa had himself acted as a *pratīhāra* (*ibid.* p. 205 fn. 1; cf., pp. 475-476). The same idea is conveyed by the invocatory verse of the Ghatiyala Prakrit inscription (No. 2)

fore, that the imperial Pratīhāras, who belonged to the Gurjara territory or tribe were Kshatriyas while the Pratīhāras of Māṇḍavyapura, who nowhere call themselves Gurjara, belonged to the Brāhmaṇa order and the royal family of Nāndīpurī was of Gurjara origin, though it had nothing to do with the Pratīhāras. Thus all these three families were totally unrelated with each other. In the reconstruction of the political history of this period a proper appreciation of this fact would help us much because, on the one hand, it would clear several misunderstandings which emanate from a wrong assumption of the blood relationship between the Pratīhāras of Māṇḍavyapura and Kanauj and, on the other, save us from such geographically impossible theories which seek to make the first member of the Nāndīpurī (southern Gujarat) royal house a son of Harichandra of Māṇḍavyapura (western Rajasthan).

Thus the Pratīhāra royal family of Māṇḍavyapura was a family of pious Brāhmaṇas. Here it is interesting to note that the later-Vedic literature knows *pratīhāra* Brāhmaṇas who performed a particular function in sacrifice.[1] In other words the term *pratīhāra* was a functional term in that period.[2] However, the members of the family of Harichandra obviously did not have anything to do with this religious function because by the beginning of the early medieval period the term *pratīhāra* had become associated with the occupation of the door-keepers as the inscription of the Pratīhāras of Mandor

रहुतिलओ पडिहारो आसी सिरिलक्खणो त्ति रामस्स ।
तेण पडिहारवंसो समुण्णाइं एत्थ सम्पत्तो ॥

(verse 2, *EI*, IX, pp. 279-81)

"Because Śrī Lakshmaṇa, the *tilaka* of the Raghu family was the Pratīhāra of Rāma, hence the Pratīhāra *Vaṁśa* has attained greatness here". This verse also does not suggest that the Pratīhāras were the descendants of Lakshmaṇa; it merely says that they bore a name which had been glorified by its connection with Lakshmaṇa (*ibid.*, p. 215, fn. 1).

1. *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*, III, 12.9.2.
2. Cf, Pathak, V.S., *Ancient Historians of India*, p. 165.

and Kanauj reveal. The fact that the descendants of Harichandra evoked Lakshmaṇa because he had cast lustre on the pratīhāra profession conclusively proves that the predecessors of Harichandra, though Brāhmaṇas, belonged to the occupational class of door-keepers.[1] As Brāhmaṇas they might have received some land during the fifth or early sixth century A.D. which might have started process of their rise. In this respect their history resembles the history of several other Brāhmaṇa families of the Gupta age such as the 'Vishṇu' family of Eraṇ,[2] the Parivrājaka dynasty of Bundelkhand[3] and the Kadamba royal house of the South[4] which were originally ordinary Brāhmaṇa families having nothing to do with politics but acquired royal status on account of the patronage of some imperial family or with the help of the sword.[5] It is quite likely that many other later Rajput families also, such as the Chāhamānas, Guhilas, Paramāras and the Chaulukyas, who were most likely of Brāhmaṇa origin,[6] started their career in the same fashion and acquired Kshatriyahood at a later date.

The inscriptions discovered from Jodhpur and Ghatiyala give the same genealogy of the Pratīhāras of Mandor, though the names of some of the rulers are given in slightly different forms. According to them Bāuka and Kakkuka, sons of Kakka (though their mothers were different, Bāuka being the son of queen Padminī and Kakkuka being the son of the queen Durla-

1. In this connection it may be recalled that when Dantidurga the Rāshṭrakūṭa emperor defeated the contemporary Pratīhāra ruler he made the latter a door-keeper in the *Hiraṇyagarbhamahādāna* ceremony performed at Ujjain (*AIK*, p. 1).
2. Sircar, D.C., *SI*, pp. 334-36.
3. *Ibid.*, pp. 394-96.
4. *Ibid.*, pp. 473 ff.
5. For a discussion on the rise of the Brāhmaṇas as a political force in the Gupta age, cf. Goyal, *HIG.*, p. 299 f.
6. For the Brāhmaṇa origin of the Chāhamānas, see D. Sharma *RTA*, I, p. 105; *Early Chauhan Dynasties*, pp. 3-10; 241-46; for the origin of the Guhilas, vide, *IHQ*, XXVIII, p. 82 f. For the origin of the Paramāras see, *Poona Orientalist*, II, pp. 49-56 also *Rājasthāna Bhāratī* III, pt. 2, pp 2-8. For the Brāhmaṇa origin of the Chaulukyas vide, Satyasraya, *Origin of Chaulukyas*.

bhadevi),[1] belonged to the twelfth generation of this family. Therefore Harichandra, its founder, may be placed in about 550 A.D. It is a very significant fact because it indicates that he was one of those adventurers who exploited the opportunity provided by the disintegration of the Vardhana (Aulikara) empire and founded a kingdom just as the Later Guptas and Maukharis had utilised this situation for making attempts for the acquisition of imperial status. According to the Jodhpur inscription, Harichandra first married a daughter of a Brāhmaṇa whose sons became Pratīhāra Brāhmaṇas. Next he married Bhadrā belonging to a noble Kshatriya family whose sons became 'drinkers of wine' (*Madhupāyins*) i.e. *Kshatriyas*.[2] In this connection it is interesting to note that according to the Arab travellers of the ninth century it was a distinct characteristic of the Brāhmaṇas that they abstain from wine and fermented liquors,[3] though *somapāna* was regarded as a usual feature in the life of a Brāhmaṇa.[4]

1. It appears that Durlabhadevī, the mother of Kakkuka, could have been the sister of Durlabharāja (I) Chāhamāna. It is suggested by the similarity of their names and their near contemporaneity. As is well known in ancient India brother and sister were some times given the same names (cf. the cases of Mahāsenagupta and Mahāsenaguptā; Harshagupta and Harshaguptā; Bhānugupta and Bhānuguptā, etc. For other references, vide, Devahuti, *Harsha*, p. 19). Now as Guvaka I, the son of Durlabharāja I, was a feudatory of Nāgabhaṭa II, the former must have flourished in the last years of the eighth century A.D. (cf. D. Sharma, *Early Chauhan Dynasties*, pp 24 ff.) while Kakka, the husband of Durlabhadevī, certainly ruled in the early decades of the ninth century, as his elder son Bāuka was already ruling in 837 A.D. It is, therefore, quite likely that Durlabhadevī was a younger sister of Durlabharāja Chāhamāna and was married to Kakka who was an important feudatory of the imperial Pratīhāras. As both these families were originally Brāhmaṇa and were also close neighbours, this matrimonial relationship should be regarded as something quite natural.
2. प्रतिहारा द्विजा भूता ब्राह्मण्यां येभवन्सुताः ।
   राज्ञी भद्रा च यान्सूते ते भूता मधुपायिनः ॥
   Pandey, R.B , *Historical and Literary Inscriptions*, p. 159.
3. Elliot and Dowson, *The History of India*, Vol. I, p. 16.
4. Cf the statement of Bāna in his *Harshacharita*, II :
   ब्राह्मणोऽस्मि जातः सोमपायिनां वंशे वात्स्यायनानाम् ।

It is not very easy to determine the status of Harichandra. He has not been given any royal title, though his wife Bhadrā has been called a 'rājñī'.[1] On the other hand, emphasis is given on his being 'well-versed in the meaning of the Vedas and the *Śāstras* and a preceptor like Prajāpati'.[2] The only *viruda* applied to him is 'Rohilladdhi'[3] the meaning of which is rather uncertain.[4] According to R.C. Majumdar it sounds rather outlandish,[5] though other scholars differ on this point.[6] The absence of any royal epithet for him would not conclusively prove that he was not an independent king.[7] Such

1. Pandey, R.B., *op. cit.*, p. 169.
2. बभूव रोहिल्लद्धयंको वेदशास्त्रार्थपारगः ।
   द्विजः श्रीहरिचन्द्राख्यः प्रजापतिसमो गुरुः ॥
   —*Loc. cit.*
3. *Loc. cit.*
4. According to N.R. Ray, (*IHQ*, IV, p. 172) who believes in the foreign descent of the Pratihāras of Mandor, the adoption of the "names" Rohilladdhi etc. prove that kings of this dynasty did not belong to the Aryan fold. "Let us consider" he writes, "three names, viz., Harichandra, Narabhaṭa and Nāgabhaṭa...(they) are undoubtedly of Sanskritic origin; but what do we say of their original names, Rohilladdhi; Pellapelli and Nāhaḍa, which they retained alongwith their Sanskritic Hindu names...? They do not seem to be Aryan Hindu names". But as pointed out by Dasharatha Sharma (*RTA*, I, p. 479 f) the argument is hardly tenable, When "in the Middle Indo-Aryan languages of Western India, names like Subhaṭa, Vāgbhaṭa and Tyāgabhaṭa become respectively Suhaḍa, Vāhaḍa and Chāhaḍa, it was not unnatural that the name Nāgabhaṭa got changed into Nāhaḍa. As for Pellapelli, why should Dr. Ray regard it as Narabhaṭa's original name when the inscription states in clear words that it was a *dvitīya* (second) name secured by him as a result of his brave deeds ? The word is formed from the root *pella* (to give pain, to throw, to press), which one finds used in standard Prakrit works like the *Setubandha, ojha-niryukti-bhāṣya, Samaraichchakahā, Kumārapālacharita* and *Prākṛitasarvasva.* We see it also in the Pāṇinian root *pelṛ*. Pellin, a noun formed from it, should have the sense of "one who habitually either gives pain to his enemies or pushes them back". This sense gets further emphasised by the duplication of the root in *Pellapelli.*
5. *EI*, XVIII, pp. 87 ff.
6. Sharma, D., *RTA*, I, p. 480.
7. For various views on this problem, vide *EI*, XVIII, p. 87 ff.

omissions in versified documents were quite common in that period. For example, the Gwalior *praśasti* of Pratihāra king Bhoja I[1] adds no royal title to Nāgabhaṭa I, calls the fourth king of this family only *Kshmāpāla* while Nāgabhaṭa II and Bhoja I, two of the greatest kings of the dynasty, are introduced without any royal epithet.

Harichandra was followed by his four sons namely, Bhogabhaṭa, Kakka, Rajjila and Dadda, who were born to Bhadrā. These princes are said to have conquered the fort of Māṇḍavyapura by their own arms where they erected a high rampart which was "calculated to increase the fear of the enemies"[2] The immediate successor of Harichandra was probably Rajjila, his third son (c. 575-600 A.D.), for it was the latter whose line ruled over Mandor in the subsequent period. It is quite likely that the elder brother of Rajjila died a premature death. According to R.C. Majumdar all the four sons of Harichandra ruled over different regions, Rajjila having been the king of Māṇḍavyapura itself.[3] This view is based upon the statement of the Jodhpur inscription according to which all the four sons of Harichandra were "fit to hold the earth"[4] But to us the interpretation of Majumdar appears to be untenable for the Jodhpur inscription gives the sons of Harichandra the credit of conquering only Māṇḍavyapura. Had they conquered more distant territories, it would have found prominent mention in this record.

Majumdar believes that the Gurjara kingdom of Nāndīpurī (South Gujarat) was founded by Dadda, the youngest son of Harichandra.[5] The earliest known date of the third king of the Gurjara family of Nāndīpurī is 629 A.D.[6] "Allowing 50 years for the two generations that preceded him," argues Majumdar, "we get the date c. 580 A.D., for the Sāmanta

1. *EI*, XVIII, pp. 99-114; Pandey, R.B., *op. cit.*, pp. 162 ff.
2. Majumdar, R.C., *loc. cit.*
3. *C.A.*, p. 65.
4. *EI*, XVIII, pp. 87 ff.
5. *Ibid.*
6. *Loc. cit.*

Dadda, who founded the line. The date corresponds so very well with that of Dadda, the youngest son of Harichandra, that the identity of the two may be at once presumed."[1] We do not agree with Majumdar's interpretation. The supposition of Majumdar is based on the assumptions that like the dynasty of Nāndīpurī, the Mandor dynasty of Harichandra was also Gurjara. But, as we have already seen, in no record are the Gurjaras of Nāndīpurī called Pratīhāras, and the Pratīhāras of Mandor Gurjaras. Further, there is absolutely no evidence to indicate that the region lying between the two kingdoms was also under the occupation of either of the two dynasties, something which must have been a fact if Dadda, the youngest son of Harichandra, carved out a kingdom in the distant southern Gujarat. Moreover, it seems highly unlikely that these Pratīhāra princes of Rajasthan whom the inscriptions of their own family give the credit of conquering only Māṇḍavyapura occupied a vast region extending up to southern Gujarat. To assume such a thing would be like arguing that in his Prayāga *praśasti* Harisheṇa could mention only the conquest of Pāṭaliputra by Samudragupta, though the Gupta emperor made himself the master of almost the whole of India. We, therefore, think that these two kingdoms were not related with each other ; they were two distinct powers of two entirely different regions having nothing in common except the name of Dadda which was adopted by a king each in their respective ruling families.[2]

Rajjila was succeeded by his son Narabhaṭa (c. 600-625 A.D.) who was also called by his second name Pellāpellī on account of his valorous deeds. Nothing has been recorded about him. His successor was his son Nāgabhaṭa (c. 625-650

1. *Loc. cit.*

2. The similarity of names can hardly become the basis of the identification of two kings of two different families. For example, we have the kings of the names of Kumāragupta and Vishṇugupta both in the imperial Gupta dynasty and the Later Gupta family. Similarity of royal names becomes significant only when such names are either unique or other facts tend to support the identity of the two rulers.

A.D.) who had his permanent capital at the great city Medāntaka (mod. Merta). Both these rulers were contemporaries of Harshavardhana, though there is absolutely nothing in the Pratīhāra records to suggest that they acknowledged the suzerainty of the great Vardhana Emperor. The suggestion of R.C. Majumdar[1] that at the time of the visit of Yuan Chwang, the Chinese traveller, to the kingdom of Ku-che-lo[2] (Gurjara), which took place in c. 640 A.D., Tāta, the son of Nāgabhaṭa was already on the throne, though attractive, lacks sufficient evidence in its support. We shall discuss this question in the next chapter, when we shall deal with the history of the successors of Nāgabhaṭa.

The Gurjaras or Chāpas of Bhillamāla

It is, however, necessary here to identify the kingdom of Ku-che-lo or Gurjara mentioned by Yuan Chwang. R.C. Majumdar identifies it with the Gurjara kingdom of the Pratīhāras of Mandor.[3] "The Chinese traveller Hiuen Tsiang," he argues, "visited a Gurjara kingdom which was about 300 miles north of Valabhī or Surath. It is a noticeable fact that the country round about Mandor exactly answers to this description. As Harichandra's dynasty was certainly ruling in the locality at the time of the pilgrim's visit, we are justified in identifying their kingdom with the one described by Hiuen-Tsiang."[4] But, as pointed out by Dasharatha Sharma,[5] the main objection to this view lies in the fact thas Yuan Chwang's Pi-lo-mo-lo, the capital of Ku-Che-lo (Gurjara) cannot phonetically turn into Mandor. If we take it to be Barmer, as proposed by Majumdar in his later contribution on this subject,[6] "We have to be sure of Barmer having been included within the kingdom of Mandor and enjoyed also the distinction of having been its capital. On the basis of Bāuka's inscription,

1. *EI*, XVIII, p. 92.
2. Watters, T., *On Yaun Chwang's Travels in India*, Vol. II, p. 249.
3. *EI*, XVIII, pp. 87 ff.
4. *Loc. cit.*
5. *RTA*, I, p. 216 fn. 1.
6. *CA*, p. 164.

however, which is our only source of information on the point, all that can be said with certainty is that during the reign of Tāta and his father Nāgabhaṭa the kingdom included the territory intervening between Mandor and Merta which is nearly 100 miles to the north-east of it".[1] Further, according to Yuan-Chwang, the population of Du-Che-lo kingdom was dense,[2] which could not have been the case with Pratīhāra kingdom of Mandor and also with Barmer. Moreover, it should not be forgotten that the Pratīhāra kingdom of Mandor has nowhere been called Gurjara while the kingdom visited by Yuan Chwang was known by this designation. Apparently this is the same Gurjara kingdom which is mentioned by Bāṇa who speaks of Prabhākaravardhana as the 'troubler of the sleep of the Gurjara',[3] by the author of the Aihole inscription who refers to the 'Lāṭa-Mālava-Gurjarāḥ' as submitting to Pulakeśin II[4] and in the Nausari Plates of Pulakeśin Avanijanāśraya of Lāṭa (c. 738 A.D.)[5] which describes the destruction of 'Saindhava-Kachchhela Saurāshṭra—Chāvoṭaka—Maurya Gurjarādirāja' by the swords of the Tajikas, i.e., the Arabs. As, according to the Arab accounts, the Arab general Junaid conquered among others the kingdoms of Bailaman and Jurz also[6] (the later being identical with Gurjara), it may be presumed that Bai'aman or Vallamaṇḍala adjoined the Gurjara state. This location fits exactly the

1. *RTA*, I, p. 216 fn. 1.
2. Watters, *Loc. cit.*
3. गुर्जरप्रजागरे...
Harshacharita, IV.
4. Pandey, R.B., *Historical and Literary Inscriptions*, pp. 240 ff.
5. प्रतापावनता यस्य लाटमालवगूर्ज्जराः ।
Bhandarkar List, No. 1220. cf. *Nāgarī Prachāriṇī Patrikā*, pt. I, p. 211, fn. 23.
6. Elliot, H.M., and Dowson, J., *The History of India* (as told by its own Historians), Vol. I, p. 126.

Ku-Che-lo, kingdom of Yuan, Chwang's account[1] and; therefore, the latter may be identified with Bhillamāla.

More light on the history of the kingdom of Bhillamāla is thrown by the famous Vasantgadh inscription of King Varmalāta, dated (Vikrama) Saṁvat 682 (625 A.D.).[2] It was found about 5 miles south of Pindwara in the erstwhile Sirohi state. It is a Śākta epigraph and its opening verses envoke the blessings of Durgā and Kshemāryā (another name of Durgā). The verse 3 of this record speaks of a King Varmalāta on whom the next verse bestows only conventional praise. He is said to have had a feudatory of the name of Vajrabhaṭa Satyāśraya who was devoted to the worship of Māṭā (Kshemāryā) and was able to guard 'the son of Himavat' i.e., the Arbuda (Abu) mountain.[3] The son of Vajrabhaṭa was Rajjila who behaved like Vaiśravaṇa, i.e. Kubera in Vaṭa (Vaṭakāra i.e. Vasantgadh) by lavishing wealth on Brāhmaṇas, personages deserving hospitality, subordinates and men skilled in arts.[4] It was during his governorship that the temple of the goddess Kshemāryā was constructed[5] by a *goshṭhī* at Vaṭakārasthāna (Vasantgadh). In the last five lines the *praśasti* gives a list of the members of the *goshṭhī* who built (or re-built) the temple. Among them are included, interestingly enough, a Pratīhāra named Boṭaka,[6] a certain Ādityabhaṭa who was a Rājasthānīya and Būṭā, who was a *mātāgaṇikā* i.e. a *devadāsī*. Thus from this inscription we learn that king Varmalāta was ruling at Bhillamala in 625 A.D. Further information about this king is provided by the *Śiśupālavadha* of Māgha. According to this work, Suprabhadeva, the grandfather of Māgha was

1. Sharma, D., *RTA*, I, pp. 109-110.
2. *EI.* IX, pp. 187-192.
3. Kielhorn, F., *ibid.*, p. 189.
4. *Ibid.*
5. According to D.R. Bhandarkar (*ibid.*, fn. 6) as a *gaṇikā* could not have been associated with the original construction of the temple, it must be presumed that it was "re-built" by the *goshṭhī* (management committee).
6. Perhaps this is the earliest epigraphical reference to the word Pratīhāra.

the minister of a king whose name is variously read as Varmalāta, Varmalākhya, Dharmanābha and Dharmalābha.[1] Now Māgha certainly flourished in the latter half of the seventh century A.D. for he makes a clear reference[2] to the *Kāśikā-Vṛitti* and the *Nyāsa* (c. 700 A.D.) thereon and also knew the *Nāgānanda* of Harsha (606-646 A.D,).[3] Therefore, almost everyone seems to have agreed with the suggestion of Kielhorn[4] that out of the numerous forms found in the manuscript of the *Śiśupālavadha*, of the name of the king at whose court Māgha's grandfather Suprabhadeva is stated to have held the office of Prime Minister, the variant Varmalāta is to be selected as the most likely one. Unfortunately neither the Vasantgadh inscription nor the *Śiśupālavadha* of Māgha reveal the identity of the dynasty to which king Varmalāta belonged. This lacuna is filled by the *Brahmasphuṭa-Siddhānta* of Brahmagupta who is himself known as *Bhillamālakāchārya* i.e. the *āchārya* of Bhillamāla.[5] He informs us that he composed his work in the Śaka year 550 (=628 A.D.),[6] i.e. 3 years after the date of the Vasantgadh record, under the patronage of King Vyāghramukha of the Chāpa dynasty. Evidently Vyāghramukha was either the successor of Varmalāta or Varmalāta himself.[7] In any event it would follow that the dynasty which ruled over Bhillamāla in the first half of the seventh century A.D. was known as Chāpa.

The Chāpas, also known as the Chāpotkaṭas or Chāvoṭakas (commonly known as Chāvaḍās, Chauḍā, Chaurā or Chavarā) were a famous Rajput clan of the early medieval

1. *CA*, p. 311.
2. *Śiśupālavadha*, 11.112.
3. Keith, A.B., *History of Sanskrit Literature*, p. 124; cf. Sharma, D., *RTA*, I, p. 517 fn. 2.
4. Quoted by D.R. Bhandarkar in *EI.* IX, p. 190; S. Konow is of the opinion that Jinendrabuddhi (the author of the *Nyāsa*) referred to by Māgha in his *Śiśupālavadha* was the contemporary of the latter and both lived in the beginning of the eighth century (*ibid.*).
5. *CA*, p. 154.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 323.
7. Ojha, G.H., *The History of Rajputana*, Vol. I, p. 145.

period. Apart from Bhillamāla they are known to have ruled over several other principalities including Vadhiar in Kathiawar and Aṇahilapāṭaka (modern Patan) in Gujarat.[1] We are not concerned with the history of other Chāpa dynasties. It may, however, be mentioned here that Haḍḍālā plates[2] of Chāpa king Dharaṇivarāha dated 914 A.D. claim that the Chāpas were produced by the *chāpa*, that is the bow of Śaṅkara, at the request of the goddess earth for her defence.[3] It is apparently a myth comparable with the *Agnikuṇḍa* legend of the origin of several Rajput families.[4] From the circumstantial evidence discussed above, however, it appears certain that the Chāpas were the rulers of the Gurjara kingdom mentioned by Yuan-Chwang. Therefore, they were either a branch of the Gurjaras or ruled over them. Unlike Jackson and Indraji,[5] scholars such as Majumdar[6] and Ojha[7] do not believe in the identity of the Chāpas and the Gurjaras. According to them the Navsari plates mention the Chāvoṭakas and Gurjaras side by side and, therefore, they must be regarded as different. But the argument is hardly tanable, for, as we have noted above, there were several Chāpa principalities in western India and the author of this record might have referred to the Chāvoṭakas of Bhillamāla as Gurjaras in order to differentiate them from other Chāpa principalities.

Here it is worthwhile to mention that the Chāpa rulers were great patrons of learning. They not only patronised Brahmagupta who wrote his famous astronomical treatise *Brahmasphuṭa-siddhānta* at Bhillamāla but also appointed Suprabhadeva, the grandfather of great poet Māgha, as their Prime

1. *CA*, p. 161.
2. *IA*, XII, p. 193.
3. *Loc. cit.*
4. For the legendary origin of the Chāpas, vide, Ojha, G.H., *op. cit.*, p. 145.
5. *Bombay Gazetteer*, I, Part I, p. 155.
6. *CA*, pp. 153-54, 161.
7. *The History of Rajputana*, I, pp. 145-146.

Minister. Yuan Chwang also informs us that the young Kshatriya king who was ruling at Ku-Che-lo at the time of his visit and was celebrated for his wisdom and valour, was a profound believer in Buddhism and a patron of exceptional abilities.[1]

Other Powers of Post-Gupta Rajasthan : The Chāhamānas

Two other powers of Rajasthan which started their political career in the post-Gupta period were the Chāhamānas and the Guhilas. Unfortunately, we do not have sufficient data pertaining to their early history. They are included among the Rajput clans of Rajasthan which shot into prominence in the post-Gupta period and eclipsed the fortunes of the earlier Kshatriya dynasties.[2] The problem of the origin of Rajput dynasties is highly complex and controversial. We agree with Dasharatha Sharma that like the Pallavas, the Kadambas and the Pratīhāras of Mandor,[3] "the Guhilas, the Chauhans and the Paramāras were originally Brāhmaṇas who adopted a military career probably to defend their culture against foreign invaders."[4]

Very little is known about the Chāhamānas till they attained prominence as feudatories of the imperial Pratīhāras

1. Watters, T., *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*, Vol. II. p. 249; cf., Beal, S., *Buddhist Records of the Western World*, Vol. II, p. 270.
2. *RTA*, I, p. 103.
3. For the Pallavas and Kadambas, vide, Sircar, D.C., *Successors of the Sātavāhanas in the Lower Deccan*, pp. 225; for the Pratīhāras of Mandor, *supra*; *CA*, p. 65; *RTA*, I, p. 215.
4. *RTA*, I, p. 105; for detailed analysis of the problem of the origin of the Chāhamānas and Guhilas in particular and Rajputs in general, vide, *ibid.*, pp. 103-106, 108-119, 439-442; Sharma, D., *Lectures on Rajput History and Culture*, pp. 1-10; Tod, James, *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan*, Vol. I, pp. 68-97; Vaidya, C.V., *History of Mediaeval Hindu India*, Vol. II (Rajputs), pp. 1-89; Ojha, G.H., *History of Rajputana*, Vol. I, pp. 41-76; Banerji, A.C., *Rajput Studies*, ch. I, Smith, V.A., *EHI*, pp. 407-415; Bhandarkar, D.R., *IA*, XLI, 1911, pp. 3-37, reprint in *JAIH*, Vol. I, pt. 1-2 (1967-68), pp. 267-328; *JBBRAS*, XXI, pp. 405 ff; Majumdar, R.C., *JDL*, X, pp. 1-76; *Bhāratīya Vidyā, K.M. Munshi Diamond Jubilee Volume*, II, pp. 1-18; Ganguli, D.C., *IHQ*, X, pp. 613-23; Raychaudhuri, G.C., *D.R. Bhandarkar Volume*, pp. 311-16; Sharma, Mrs. M., *IHQ*, XXVIII, p. 83 f.

in the age of Nāgabhaṭa II (known date 815[1] and 833[2] A.D.). This phase of their history is beyond the scope of present work. The Chāhamāna contemporary of Nāgabhaṭa II was Gūvaka I. According to the Bijolia inscription,[3] Sāmanta who is described as a Vipra born in the Vatsa *gotra* at Ahichchhatrapura preceded Gūvaka I by six generations. His reign may therefore, be placed in the third quarter of the seventh century A.D.[4] However, nothing about his achievements is known so far. His relationship with Vāsudeva, the founder of the Chāhamāna dynasty, who is placed in V.S. 608 (=551 A.D.) by the *Prabandhakośa*[5] is also unknown to us, and so are the circumstances which led the latter to adopt a political career.[6] The location of the kingdom over which he ruled is not definite. But as pointed out by D. Sharma, no part of the available evidence would go against the hypothesis that the cradle-land of the Chāhamānas was in the tract extending approximately from Pushkara in the south to Harsha in the north—the region which was known as Jāṅgaladeśa and which included the tract known as Śākambharī Sapādalaksha.[7]

The Guhilas

The Guhilas (the Guhilaputras or Guhilots)[8] of Mewar are regarded as the crest-jewel of the Rajput clans.[9] A Large number of legends and bardic tales have clustered round this name. It is very difficult, therefore, to reconstruct the history

1. Buchkala Inscription, *EI*, IX, pp. 198-200.
2. Known from the *Prabhāvaka-Charita* (*JIH*. XXII, p, 104), quoted in the *Age of the Imperial Kanauj*, p. 27.
3. *EI*, XXVI, pp. 90-100.
4. Cf. Sharma, D., *Early Chauhan Dynasties*, p. 23.
5. Quoted by Dasharatha Sharma in *Early Chauhan Dynasties*, p. 23.
6. Since the later kings of this dynasty were ruling over Sapādalaksha it may be presumed that Vāsudeva belonged to the same region.
7. Sharma, D., *Early Chauhan Dynasties*, p. 11. f.
8. They have also been called Gobhilaputra and Gaubilya in Sanskrit epigraphs while Gohila, Gahalota and Gaibalota in varnacular languages; cf. Ojha, G.H., *History of Rajputana*, Vol. II (*Udaipur Rājya kā Itihāsa*), pp. 369-70.
9. *CA*, p. 157.

of the various dynasties of this clan, especially when we consider these traditions alongwith the divergent views of modern scholars.

A full genealogy of this family is found for the first time in the Aṭpur inscription of Śaktikumāra, dated A.D. 977.[1] It gives the name of 20 rulers from Guhadatta to Śaktikumāra. If we assume that a generation is to be allotted about 22 years, Guhadatta may be regarded as having flourished in the middle of the sixth century A.D.[2] As we have seen, it was precisely the period when the Pratīhāras of Māṇḍavyapura and the Chāhamānas of Sapādalaksha started their political career. It is, therefore, not unlikely that like his Pratīhāra and Chāhamāna counterparts, the founder of the Guhila family also exploited the anarchical situation of north India created by the disintegration of the Gupta and Aulikara-Vardhana empires. The records of Śīla[3] (Śīlāditya) and Aparājita,[4] the fifth and sixth kings of the Aṭpur list, belonging to 646 A.D. and 661 A.D. respectively corroborate the suggestion that Guhadatta flourished in the sixth century A.D. This conclusion based on undeniable epigraphic evidence demolishes to its very root the traditional account recorded in the bardic tales that Guha or Guhila, the founder of the family, was the son of Śīlāditya, the last ruler of Valabhī.[5] It is now definitely known that the Valabhī king Śīlāditya of the Maitraka dynasty ruled in the third quarter of the eighth century A.D.[6] He, therefore, could not have been the royal father of Guhadatta.

The origin of the Guhilas has been made a matter of prolonged controversy. Medieval works such as *Akabaranāmā* of Abul-Fazl connect them with Iran[7] while Tod who relied on

1. *IA*, 1910, p. 191; *Journal and Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, VIII, pp. 63 ff.
2. *CA*, p. 157.
3. Vide Samoli Inscription, *EI*, XX, pp. 97-99.
4. E*I*, VI, p, 29-32.
5. *CA*, p. 157.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 150.
7. Cf. *Bombay Gazetteer*, Vol. I, pt. I, p. 102; Tod, J., *op. cit.*, I, pp. 71-72.

the tradition mentioned above believed that they were the descendents of the Valabhi rulers.[1] Many scholars including V.A. Smith[2] have suggested foreign origin of this clan. D.R. Bhandarkar[3] twisted this theory to some extent and tried to prove that the Guhilas were Brāhmaṇas of foreign descent. G.H. Ojha[4] and his supporters, however, neglected or misinterpreted the epigraphic evidence to show that the Guhilas were the descendents of the Vedic Kshatriyas of the Solar stock. But as Dasharatha Sharma,[5] G.N. Sharma[6] and many others[7] have repeatedly emphasised, the Brāhmaṇa origin of the Guhilas is beyond doubt. According to D. Sharma the early records of the family present it as a *Vipra* i.e. a Brāmaṇa family. Guhadatta has been called not only *Viprakulanandanaḥ* but also *Mahīdevaḥ* [8] Similarly, Bappā is called a *Vipra* in a Chittorgarh inscription[9] of 1274 A.D. Further, in the Achaleshwar (Abu) inscription[10] of 1285 A.D. Bappā is also said to have exchanged Brahma for Kshatra splendour,[11] which correctly indicates the position of the Guhilas among the Rajputs. "They were originally Brāhmaṇas", concludes D. Sharma, "but either ambition or political exigencies made them take to a military career

1. Tod, J., *op. cit.*, p. 247; 251-60; 275-77. Kavirāja Shyāmaldas (*Vira Vinod*, pt. I, pp. 186, 239, 247-49) partially accepted the theory of Tod but differed with the latter in details.
2. *EHI*, pp. 407 ff.
3. *IA*, XVI, p. 347.
4. Ojha, G.H., *op. cit.*, pp. 371-383.
5. *RTA*, I, pp. 105, 230.
6. *Rājasthāna kā Itihāsa*, pt. I, pp. 38-39; *PIHC*, 1951, pp. 367-372; *University of Rajasthan Studies*, 1965-66, pp. 5-10.
7. Sharma, Mrs. M., *IHQ*, XXVIII, p. 83 f.
8. *IA*, 1910, p. 191, quoted by D. Sharma in *RTA*, I, p. 234, fn. 1.
9. *Bhavanagar Inscriptions*, pt. IV, pp. 74-77.
10. *Ibid*,, V, pp. 83-87.
11. हारीतात्किल वप्पकोऽङ्घ्रिवलयव्याजेन लेभे महः

क्षात्रं धातृनिभाद्वितीयं(?) मुनये ब्राह्मं स्वसेवाच्छलात् ।

एतेऽद्यापि महीभुजः क्षितितले तद्वंशसंभूतयः

शोभंते सुतरामुपात्तवपुषः क्षात्रा हि धर्माइव ॥

ibid.

and the society in due course recognised them as Kshatriyas." No epigraph belonging to a period earlier than the twelfth century expressly describes the Guhilas as Kshatriyas of the Solar race. This tradition originated and evolved in the medieval period.

So far as the original home of the Guhilas is concerned in the later phase of their history, they are found ruling over Mewar. But they could not have originally belonged to Chitor The Aṭpur inscription informs us that Guhadatta came from Anandapur which has been identified with Vadanagar in the former Baroda State.[2] They belonged to Vaijavāpa *gotra* which is found mostly on the Gujarat side.[3] Dasharatha Sharma conjectures that they might have migrated from Gujarat and their early home in Rajasthan might have been in south-west Mewar.[4] From this region we have three of their early records, though the relationship of the kings mentioned in these inscriptions with the Guhilas of Mewar, known from the Aṭpur inscription,[5] is difficult to determine. One of these epigraphs is dated in 73rd year. It was engraved in the reign of Mahārāja Bhaṭṭi of Kishkindhā i. e. Kalyanpur (about 68 km to the south of Udaipur).[6] Another belongs to king Bhāvihita and carries the date 48.[7] The third one was issued by the Guhila chief Bābhaṭa in the year 83.[8] Dasharatha Sharma suggests that these rulers wera related with each other and may be placed in the same chronological order which is indicated by the dates of their inscriptions. Scholars usually ascribe the date of these records to the Harsha era.[9] In that case Bhāvihita, Bhaṭṭi and Bābhaṭa would be placed in A.D. 654, 679 and 689 respectively. But D. Sharma suggests that they are dated in an era

1. *RTA*, I, p. 234.
2. *IA*, 1910, p. 191; *JPASB*, VIII, pp. 63 ff.
3. *RTA*, I, p. 234.
4. *Loc. cit.*, cf. Ojha, G.H., *op. cit.*, pp. 389, 400 fn. 1.
5. *EI*, XXX, pp. 1 ff.
6. *Ibid.*
7. *EI*, XXXIV, pp. 177 ff.
8. *Ibid.*
9. Sircar, D.C., *EI*, XXX, pp. 6-6; Mirashi, V.V., (*EI*, XXX, p. 2) does not agree with this view and suggests that the years 73 of the Dhulev plate of Mahārāja Bhaṭṭi is of the Bhaṭika era.

founded by Guhila.[1] If this suggestion is correct no precise date for these rulers may be given as the date of accession of Guhila itself is unknown.

Guhila was regarded as their earliest ancestor both by the Guhilas of Kishkindhā as well as of Mewar.[2] No inscription of this ruler has come to light so far. As we have already seen, he may be placed in the middle of the sixth century A.D. In case he was the founder of an era, as Dasharatha Sharma suggests, he must have been a powerful king. Probably the whole of south-west Mewar and some adjoining regions lay within his dominion.[3] Some silver coins, about 2000 in number discovered at Agra were ascribed to him by G.H. Ojha,[4] while R.L. Samar has described 9 copper coins belonging to this ruler, 6 of which are silver plated.[5]

Guhila was succeeded by Bhoja who is described as the worshipper of Vishṇu in Achaleśvara (Abu) inscription (V.S. 1342=1285 A.D.) of Samarasiṁha.[6] Two of his copper coins are known so far.[7] Nothing more about him and his successor Mahendranāga is known from available sources. According to some scholars Mahendranāga was the founder of Nāgdā.[8] Ojha, however, suggests that Mahendra and Nāga were two different rulers.[9]

According to G. H. Ojha, Nāgāditya was succeeded by Śīla or Śīlāditya.[10] His inscription dated (Vikrama) Saṁvat

1. *Loc. cit.* R.L. Samar (*JIH*, XL, p. 345 ff), however, suggests that this is a local era which was started from the date of the accession of Bappā.
2. For a detailed study, vide, Sircar, D.C., *The Guhilas of Kishkindhā*, Calcutta, 1965.
3. *RTA*, I, p. 235.
4. Ojha, G.H., *op. cit.*, p. 400, fn. 1.
5. *JNSI*, XX, pp 27-29; cf. Sharma, G.N., *Rājasthāna kā Itihāsa ke Srota* pt. I, 26.
6. *Bhavanagar Inscriptions*, V, p. 83-87.
7. *RTA*. I, p. 236.
8. Ojha, G.H., *op. cit.*, 395, cf. Jain, K.C., *Ancient Cities and Towns of Rajasthan*, p. 213.
9. Ojha, G.H., *op. cit.*, pp. 395, 402.
10. Ojha, G.H., *op. cit.*, pp. 402-403.

703 (=646 A.D.) was discovered from Samoli in Bhomat District of the former Mewar State.[1] It shows that Mewar-Sirohi border was included in his dominion. This epigraph describes him as a giver of delight to the gods, Brāhmaṇas and *gurus*, a conqueror of enemies and a moon on the earth for his clan and[2] refers to the building of a temple of Araṇyavāsinī by the merchant chief Jejaka or Jentaka, who alongwith his friends migrated from Vaṭanagara,[3] and had an *āgara* in the hilly area adjoining Samoli.[4] Only one copper coin of Śīlāditya is known so far.[5] James Tod has identified him with Bappā of legends. We shall discuss this suggestion in the next chapter.

Rajasthan and Harshavardhana of Kanauj

In the first half of the seventh century A.D. the history of north India was greatly influenced by the political activities and conquests of Harshavardhana (606-c. 646 A.D.) of Kanauj. Unfortunately, nothing precisely is known of his relations with Rajasthan. The controversy regarding the extent

1. *EI*, XX, pp. 97-99.
2. जयति विजयी रिपूनां(णां) देवद्विजगुरु-
जणा (ना) नंन्दीः (नन्दी) ।
श्रीशीलादित्यो नरपति (तिः) स्वकुलाव (म्ब)
र चन्द्रमा (माः) पृथ्वी (पृथ्व्याम्) ॥
ibid., p. 99.
3. Vaṭanagara has been identified by D.R. Bhandarkar (*EI*, IX, p. 189) and R.R Halder (*EI*, XX, p, 93) with Vasantgadh in the former Sirohi state, about 16 miles from Samoli from where the epigraph was discovered, cf., Jain, K.C., *op. cit.*, pp. 163 ff.
4. जयति वटनगर विनिर्गत महाजन (नां) जे (न्त) क प्रमुखः ।
येनास्य लोकजीवनं आ (नमा) गरमुप्ता (त्पा) दितं (त) मारण्यकगिरीः (रौ) ।...तत्र (जेन्त) क महतर (त्तरः) श्री अरण्यवासिण्या (न्या) देवकुलं चक्रे महाजनादिष्ट (ष्टः) ॥
—*loc. cit.*
5. *RTA*, I, p. 237.

of his empire[1] makes this problem all the more difficult. According to group of historians including V.A. Smith, M.L. Ettinghausen and K.M. Panikkar, the empire of Harsha included almost the whole of northern India from Kāmarūpa in the east to Sindh in the west and Kashmir and Nepal in the north to the Narmada in the south,[2] though they disagree with each other regarding its detailed boundaries. Such a view implies that Harsha exercised his suzerainty over Rajasthan also. On the other hand, R.C. Majumdar believes that "at first Harsha's kingdom comprised merely the territories of the old states of Thaneswar and Kanauj, though he probably added some small principalities to the north and west. It may be said to have comprised the eastern Punjab and Uttar Pradesh. Towards the close of his reign, he had annexed Magadha and even pushed his conquest as far as Orissa and Kongoda".[3] In such a view there is no scope to believe that Harsha had an effective control over Rajasthan. Now the problem of the extent of the empire of Harsha is beyond the scope of our present work ; we are concerned only with the question whether he had anything to do with Rajasthan or not. The answer to this question is bound to depend entirely upon indirect and circumstantial evidence. For example, the first group of historians may argue that as the empire of Harsha included

1. For a detailed description and analysis vide, Smith, V.A., *EHI*, p. 352-354 and map, opp. p. 354; Ettinghausen, M.L., *Harshavardhana : Amperur at poete, etc.* (Paris, 1906) pp. 47 ff, Panikkar, K.M., *Śrī Harsha of Kanauj* (Bombay, 1922) pp. 22 ff; Mookerji, R.K., *Harsha* (Oxford, 1926) pp. 37-43; Chatterji, G.S., *Harshavardhana* (in Hindi) (Allahabad, 1950) pp. 169 f ; Tripathi, R.S., *History of Kanauj to the Moslem conquest* (Varanasi, 1959). IV-V; Devahuti, D., *Harsha : A Political Study* (Oxford,1970) ch. IV; Sharma, B.N., *Harsha and His Times* (Varanasi, 1970), ch. V-VI; Majumdar, R.C., *CA*, pp. 102ff; Goyal, S.R., *Itihāsa Samīkshā*, 2, 1971, pp. 120 ff; Chattopadhyaya, S., *EHNI*, ch. IX, pp. 243-273.

2. Cf. e.g. "In the later years of his reign the sway of Harsha over the whole of the basin of the Ganges (including Nepal) from the Himalaya to the Narmadā, besides Malwa, Gujarat, and Surāshṭra, was undisputed" (*EHI*, p. 354).

3. *CA*, p. 113; cf. also Tripathi, R.S., *op. cit.*, p. 119.

Sindh, Gujarat and Malwa, Rajasthan must have been included in it. But this argument assumes that Harsha was the lord of Sindh, Gujarat and Malwa, a conclusion which is not acceptable to Majumdar and his followers. Yuan Chwang, who visited western India in c. 641 A.D., does not at all hint that the kings of Valabhī,[1] Sindh[2] and Malwa[3] were subordinate to Harsha. Of the states of Rajasthan he refers to only Po-li-ye-ta-lo[4] or Pāriyātra, the capital of which was Bairat, and Ku-che-lo[5] or the Gurjara country which had Pi-lo-mo-lo as its capital. About the kingdom of Po-li-ye-ta-lo, the Chinese pilgrim states that it was ruled by a king "of the Fei-She (Vaiśya) stock" who was "a man of courage and military skill."[6] To us it appears that here Yuan-Chwang is referring to the contemporary king of the Later Gupta dynasty. As we have already pointed out the Bairat area was ruled by the Later Guptas and Kumāragupta and Mādhavagupta, the sons of Mahāsenagupta, and taken shelter with Prabhākaravardhana, probably because of the successful intrigues of Devagupta, most likely a relation of Mahāsenagupta. It is quite possible that at the time of Yuan Chwang's visit a relation of Devagupta was ruling over this region. Incidentally our suggestion, if correct, would show that the Later Guptas belonged to the Vaiśya caste, an information which is not disclosed by any other source.

Another state of Rajasthan mentioned by Yuan Chwang is the Gurjara kingdom, the capital of which was Bhillamāla, modern Bhinmal of the Jodhpur region. According to the Chinese pilgrim the king of this country who "was a Kshatriya

1. Watters, T., *On Yuan-Chwang's Travels in India*, Vol. II, pp. 246-47; Beal, S., *Buddhist Records of the Western World*, Vol. II, pp. 266-68; Hui-Li, *The Life of Hiuen Tsiang*, p. 149.
2. Watters, *Travels*, II, pp. 252-253, 256, 258, 259-61; Beal, *Records*, II, pp. 276, 279-80.
3. Watters, *Travels*, II, pp. 242-43; Beal, *Records*, II p. 260-65, Hui-Li, *Life*, p. 148.
4. Watters, *Travels*, I, p. 300; Beal, *Records*, I, p. 179.
5. Watters, *Travels*, II, pp. 249-50; Beal, *Records*, II, pp. 269-70.
6. Watters, *Travels*, I, p. 300.

by birth, was a young man celebrated for his wisdom and valour and he was a profound believer in Buddhism, and a patron of exceptional abilities."[1] As has been suggested in the preceding pages, here Yuan Chwang has most likely referred *to the Chāpa kingdom which had nothing to* do with Harshavardhana. Thus Yuan Chwang did not see anything which would indicate Harsha's suzerainty over Rajasthan.

Another line of inquiry is suggested by the testimony of Bāṇa. Firstly, he refers to the hostility of the kingdoms of Sindhu, Gurjara, Lāṭa and Mālava with Prabhākaravardhana who was a source of constant trouble for them.[2] It has been argued that their enmity to the Vardhanas might have continued in the next reign also. Further, according to Bāṇa, Harsha decided upon world-wide conquest and ordered his minister of War and Peace to issue a proclamation throughout India asking all the kings either to accept his suzerainty or to fight with him.[3] After this declaration he commenced his march "for the subjugation of all the four quarters."[4] But unfortunately Bāṇa does not inform us about the progress and result of this campaign. It has given wide scope to scholars for imaginary reconstruction of the military achievements of Harshavardhana.

1. Watters, *Travels*, II, p. 249; cf. Beal, *Records*, II, p. 270.
2. हूणहरिणकेसरी सिन्धुराजज्वरो गुर्जरप्रजागरो
   गान्धाराधिपगन्धद्विपकूटपाकलो
   लाटपाटवपाटच्चरो मालवलक्ष्मीलतापरशुः

   Harshacharita, IV.

   Cf. Eng. Trans. by E B. Cowell and F.W. Thomas, p. 101; for their identification vide, Buddha Prakash, *Aspects of Indian History and Civilization*, pp. 170-72; for comments, *CA*, pp. 97-98.
3. Harshacharita, Trans. Cowell and Thomas, *op. cit.*, pp. 187-88.
4. ततश्च तथाकृतप्रतिज्ञे प्रयाणं विजयाय दिशां समादिशति...

   op. cit., p. 194

   अथ नचिरादिव प्रथमप्रयाण एव दिग्विजयाय दिग्गजसमागममिव...

   op. cit., p. 203.

Now, as regards the reference in the *Harshacharita* of the hostility of the Lāṭas, Mālavas and Gurjaras to the Vardhanas, it may be noted that the same powers have been enumerated in the Aihole inscription[1] of the Chālukya king Pulakeśin II. According to this epigraph these powers voluntarily accepted the overlordship of the Chālukya monarch.[2] Some scholars believe that one of the reasons which led these powers to accept this subordinate position was their anxiety to seek Chālukya protection against Vardhana imperialism.[3] As the Gurjaras of this list definitely belonged to Rajasthan (whether to Mandor as R. C. Majumdar believes[4] or Bhillamāla as we have suggested), such a view would imply that Harsha either exercised some influence over parts of Rajasthan or was a source of danger to this area. According to Majumdar the three powers enumerated above "formed a group of buffer states between Harsha and Pulakeśin II, and could rely upon the protection of the latter against the aggressive designs of the former."[5] But such an assumption is altogether unwarranted. There is nothing to show that these three states were afraid of Harsha or Harsha had sought to impose his suzerainty over them.

It may also be argued that the prevalence of the Harsha era[6] in Rajasthan may indicate that Harsha had some sort of

1. Pandey, R.B., *Historical and Literary Inscriptions* (Varanasi, 1962), pp. 240 ff; *EI*, VI, pp. 10 ff.
2. प्रतापावनता यस्य लाटमालवगूर्ज्जराः ।
   दण्डोपनतसामन्तचर्य्या चार्य्या इवाभवन् ॥
   Pandey, R.B., *op. cit.*, pp. 243.
3. *EI*, VI, p. 10, fn. 5.
4. *Ibid.*, XVIII, p. 92.
5. *CA*, p. 1, p. 5.
6. It is generally believed that the Harsha Saṁvat was founded by Harshavardhana in A.D. 606, the year of his accession. But according to R.C. Majumdar (*IHQ*, XXVII, pp. 183 ff; XXVIII, pp. 280 ff.) this view rests upon very slender foundations. Contrast D.C. Sircar (*ibid*, XXVII, pp. 321 ff; XXIX, pp. 72 ff.) who subscribes to the former theory.

hold over this region. But the prevalence of an era in a particular area was not always preceded by the actual rule of the king who initiated that era in that particular region. The Mālava-Vikrama Saṁvat is found used over greater part of India, though neither the Mālavas nor the legendary Vikramāditya had anything to do with a number of regions where this era is found prevalent today. The case of the Śaka era is quite similar.[1]

From the above discussion it is quite apparent that there is no *positive* evidence whatsoever to prove the sway of Harsha over Rajasthan. But lest we should be misunderstood, we must make it clear that the available data is not sufficient to believe that Harsha was regarded as their overlord by the contemporary rulers of Rajasthan and, therefore, in the present state of our knowledge it would be better not to include this part of the country within the sphere of Harsha's influence. However, it is quite likely that it is only a case of the limitation of available material. In future some evidence may turn up which may indicate that Harsha exercised some sort of influence over this area. Harsha certainly had something to do with Lāṭa and Saurāshṭra i.e. the kingdom of the Gurjaras of Baroach

1. In addition to Banskhera (*EI*, IV, pp. 208-11) and Madhuban (*EI*, I, pp. 67-75) copper plates of Harsha, following records are now generally believed to be dated according to the Harsha Saṁvat :

(i) Kot Inscription (Bharatpur) of the year 48. (*Annual Report of the Rajputana Museum*, Ajmer, 1916-17, p. 2)

(ii) Two copper grants from Dungarpur, dated in the 48 and 83 (*EI*, XXXIV, p. 167.)

(iii) Tasai Inscription (Alwar) of the year 182. (*EI*, XXXVI, pp. 49 ff)

(iv) Dabak Inscription (Udaipur) of the year 207. (*EI*, XX, pp. 122-25.)

(v) Kaman Inscription (Bharatpur) of the year 263. (*EI*, XXVI, pp. 52 ff.)

(vi) Kaman Inscription (Bharatpur) containing seven different dates. (*EI*, XXIV, pp. 329-36.)

and of the Maitrakas of Valabhī.[1] Therefore, it should not be regarded as beyond the bounds of possibility that Rajasthan was also influenced by his military activities. But whether such was actually the case is something which may be decided by future discoveries only.

1. As is quite well known the inscriptions of the Gurjaras of Baroach exultingly mention the fact that Dadda II obtained great glory by protecting (or rescuing) the lord of Valabhī who had been overpowered by 'the great lord, the illustrious Harshadeva'. (*IA*, XIII, pp. 77-79.)

CHAPTER V

RAJASTHAN IN THE POST-HARSHA CENTURY

The history of North India in the post-Harsha period was marked by chaos and confusion for about a hundred years till the imperial Pratihāras in the west and Pālas in the east once again established two important centres of political power in North India. In the post-Harsha century several attempts were made, notably by the Later-Guptas (who, after the death of Harsha emerged in Magadha),[1] Yaśovarman of Kanauj and Lalitāditya Muktāpīḍa of Kashmir to establish an extensive and powerful empire, but none of them was successful. Ultimately it were the Pratihāras of Kanauj(who originated probably in Jalor)[2] and the Pālas of Bengal (who established their capital at Pāṭaliputra)[3] who succeeded in bringing about sa emblance of political order in North India. At least Rajasthan continued to remain fragmented into several political units till the rise of the imperial Pratihāras. The greatest local powers of this part of the country in this period were the Guhilas of Medapāṭa (Mewar) and the Pratihāras of Māṇḍavyapura (Mandor).

The Guhilas of Medapāṭa

In the preceding chapter we discussed the history of Guhilas upto Śīlāditya whose known date is Saṁvat (Vikrama) 703 (=646 A.D.).[4] Before we proceed further it is necessary

1. For the history of the Later Guptas of Magadha vide, *CA*, pp. 126 ff; Sinha, B.P., *DKM*, Ch. X; Devahuti, *Harsha*, Ch. II.
2. Cf. Sharma, D., *RTA*, pp. 120 ff, 480-83.
3. For a detailed account see, Majumdar, R.C. (ed.), *History of Bengal*, Vol. I, Ch. IV; *Ancient History of Bengal*, Calcutta, 1971).
4. Cf. Samoli Inscription, *EI*, XX, pp. 90 ff.

here to discuss the problem of the identification of Bappā[1] Rāwal of legends. He has not been mentioned in the Aṭpur inscription of Śaktikumāra, dated A. D. 977,[2] but he heads the genealogical list given in the records dating from the thirteenth century A.D.[3] The earlier records of this category inform us that Bappā came from Ānandapura, worshipped at the feet of a sage named Hārita-rāśi, and through the grace of the latter became the king of Chitrakūṭa (Chitorgarh).[4] According to the the later records, Bappā, who obtained the favour of Hārita-rāśi, conquered Chitorgarh from the Mori king Māna and adopted the title of Rāwal[5] The different chronicles agree in placing him in the first half of the eighth century.[6] Tod is of the opinion that Bappā occupied Chitor in 720 A.D. and abdicated the throne in 764 A.D.[7] Other authorities including Ojha give varying dates within these limits.[8]

From the facts given above it is apparent that Bappā could not have been the founder of the Guhilot dynasty. He must have flourished about two centuries after Guhadatta who heads the list of the Guhila kings in the Aṭpur record. In the Chitorgarh inscription of V.S. 1331 (=1274 A.D.)[9] and the Achaleśvara (Abu) inscription of V.S. 1342 (=1285 A.D.)[10] Bappā is mentioned as Guhila's father. But it cannot be a fact for an earlier inscription of Naravāhana's reign (V.S. 1028=971

1. Also spelled as Bapa, Bappa, Bāppā, Bappaka, Bashpa, etc. Cf. Ojha, G.H., *History of Rajputana*, Vol. II, p. 405.
2. *IA*, XXXIX, pp. 190 ff.
3. *CA*, p. 158.
4. Cf. Achaleśvara (Abu) Inscription of V.S. 1342, *Bhavanagar Inscriptions*, V, pp. 83 ff; *JPASB*, 1909, p. 170; *IHQ*, XXVI, p, 263; XXVIII, p. 83, Banerjee, A.C., *Rajput Studies*, pp. 8 ff.
5. Cf. Ojha, G.H., *op. cit.*, pp. 407 ff.; Tod, J., *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan*, Vol. I, pp. 260 ff.; Sharma, G.N., *Rājasthāna kā Itihāsa*, pt. I, pp. 43 ff.
6. *CA*, p. 157.
7. Tod, *op.cit.*, p. 269.
8. Ojha, G.H., *op. cit.*, p. 414; cf, *IA*, XXXIX pp. 190 , ff; Shyāmaldās, Kavirāja, *Vīra Vinoda*, pt. I, p. 252. For an early date, vide, Sharma, G,N., *op. cit.*, pp. 48-49,
9. *Bhavanagar Inscriptions*, IV, pp. 74 ff.
10. *Ibid.*, V, pp. 83 ff.

A.D.)[1] known as the Ekaliṅga *praśasti* mentions Bappaka as the moon in the family of Guhila. However, his historicity remains undoubted. He must, therefore, be regarded as identical with one or more of the Guhila kings, who flourished in the period discussed in the present chapter. As is obvious *Bappā* is not an individual name but an honorific title.[2] Therefore, any one of the kings belonging to this period could have been given this *biruda*. Even the discovery of a few coins of Bappā with the legend Śrī-Vappa[3] would not prove that Bappā was the personal name of this ruler. Many coins of the Gupta rulers bear only their titles without disclosing their first names.[4] It should also be kept in mind that the genuineness of 'Śrīvappa' coins is extremely doubtful as they depict an unusually large number of motifs connected with Bappā Rāwal of tradition.

Bappā of tradition has been identified by Col. Tod[5] and G. C. Raychaudhuri[6] with Śīla or Śīlāditya of the Samoli inscription[7] while Kavirāja Shyāmaldās[8] identified him with Mahendra, G.H. Ojha[9] with Kālabhoja and D.R. Bhandar-

1. *Ibid.*, II, pp. 69 ff. The name of Bappā finds a mention for the first time in this record (गुहिलगोत्रनरेन्द्रचन्द्रः श्रीबप्पकक्षितिपतिः क्षितिपीठरत्नम्). Dhuleva plate of Mahārāja Bhaṭṭi (*EI*, XXX, pp. 1 ff.) also mentions one Bappadatti as the father of the former, who belonged to the Guhila family. But according to Dasharatha Sharma (*RTA*, p. 241) he was probably different from Bappa of Nāga, known from the above Ekaliṅga *praśasti* of Naravāhana's reign.
2. Many scholars such as Kavirāja Shyāmaldās (*Vīra-Vinoda*, pt. I, p. 250), G.H. Ojha, (*op. cit.*, p. 405), R.C. Majumdar (*CA*, p. 158) and Dasharatha Sharma (*RTA*, I, p. 241) subscribe to this view. However, they disagree on the question of the identification of Bappā. Contra, Sharma, G.N., *op. cit.*, p. 47.
3. Ojha, G.H., *Nāgarī Prachāriṇī Patrikā*, I, pp. 241-286; *History of Rajputana*, Vol. II, pp. 415-16; Samar, R.L., *JNSI*, XX, pp. 26 ff; Altekar, A.S., *Ibid.*, pp. 30-31.
4. Altekar, A.S., *Coinage*, pp. 56, 60, 67.
5. Tod, James, *op. cit.*, p. 270.
6. *History of Mewar*. p. 30, quoted in *RTA*, I, pp. 236-37.
7. *EI*, XX, pp. 97-99.
8. *Vīra-Vinoda*, pt. I, p. 250.
9. *History of Rajputana*, Vol. II, pp. 406 ff.

kar[1] with Khummāṇa. R.C. Majumdar[2] prefers the last theory "in view of the celebrity of the name Khummāṇa in the history and tradition of Mewar."[3] Dasharatha Sharma wants to leave this question open.[4] In his view Bappā might have been any one of the above mentioned rulers or even some one else, the only certainty being that he flourished a good deal before 971 A.D. when the name Bappā finds mention for the first time in the inscriptions of the Guhilas of Mewar.[5] As regards the theory of Tod and Raychaudhuri, it has been pointed out in its support that the Kumbhalgarh inscription of V.S. 1517 (=1460 A.D.)[6] replaces the name of Śila by that of Bappā. Further, as has been pointed out by Dasharatha Sharma, if achievements alone be any consideration in deciding the issue of the identity of Bappā, Śilāditya has as good a claim as any other ruler of Mewar to this title,[7] for he gave good rule to his people[8] and had many political victories to his credit.[9] In the Chitorgarh inscription of V.S. 1331 (1274 A.D.) it is said that he accepted the Goddess of Victory who had become disgraced by coming into contact with the inimical *Mātaṅgas*, after bathing her in the water from the edge of his sword.[10] It seems that he restored the fortunes of the family, after its eclipse at the hands of the Bhils or Meds i. e. the *Mātaṅgas*[11] But there is nothing in particular to support his identification with Bappā of tradition. To think that Kumbhalgarh inscription of 1460 A.D.[12] puts Bappā in

1. *IA*, 1910, p. 190. But Bhandarkar's list of North Indian inscriptions shows that he now identifies Bappā with Khummāṇa's grandson, Siṁha.
2. *CA*, p. 158.
3. Cf. Banerjee, A.C., *Rajput Studies*, p. 25.
4. *RTA*, I, p. 241.
5. *Loc. cit.*
6. *EI*, XXIV, pp. 314-28.
7. *RTA*, I, p. 237.
8. Cf. *EI*, XX, pp. 97 ff.
9. Cf. *Bhavanagar-Inscriptions*, IV, pp. 74 ff.
10. *Loc. cit.*
11. *RTA*, I, p. 237.
12. *EI*, XXIV, pp. 314 ff.

place of Śilāditya is obviously a mistake, for according to the *Ekaliṅgamāhātmya* Bappā became an ascetic in V.S. 810 (= 753 A.D.)[1] while Śīlāditya flourished a century earlier, his known date being 646 A.D.[2]

Shyāmaladās identifies Bappā with Kālabhoja's predecessor Mahendra[3] because the *Ekaliṅgamāhātmya* mentions Bhoja (whom the Kavirāja identifies with Kālabhoja) as Bappā's son. But this hypothesis is untenable, for Bhoja of the *Ekaliṅgamāhātmya* was actually Guhila's son and hence he cannot be identified with Kālabhoja.[4] Further, Mahendra must have ruled in the second half of the seventh century A. D. while according to the tradition accepted by the Kavirāja himself, Bappā ruled upto at least 753 A.D.[5]

Śīlāditya was succeeded by Aparājita whose inscription of V.S. 718 (=661 A.D.)[6] records the building of a temple by Yaśomatī, the wife of his general Varāhasiṁha. G. H. Ojha identifies Bappā with Kālabhoja, the grandson of Aparājita.[7] That the reign of Kālabhoja was a remarkable one, can hardly be doubted. In the Achaleśvara (Abu) inscription of V.S. 1342 (=1285 A.D.)[8] he has been described as having achieved significant successes against the lords of Karṇāṭas and Choḍas.[9] It is difficult to determine the true significance of this claim. G.C. Raychaudhuri thinks that Kālabhoja fought against the Chālukya ruler Vinayāditya who claims to have led an expedition to north India.[10] But Vinayāditya belonged to Bādāmī and not Choḍa and he is not known to have invaded Mewar. We believe that Kālabhoja's achievements may be best explained by the hypothesis that he was a feudatory of

1. *Ekaliṅgamāhātmya*, Ch. 20, Verses 21-22.
2. Cf. Samoli Inscription of V.S. 703, *EI*, XX, pp. 97 ff.
3. *Vīra-Vinoda*, pt. I, p. 250.
4. *RTA*, I, p. 238.
5. *Vīra Vinoda*, pt. I, pp. 250 ff; cf. Ojha, G.H., *op. cit.*, pp. 410 ff.
6. *EI*, IV, p. 31.
7. Ojha, G H., *op. cit.*, pp. 406 ff.
8. *Bhavanagar Inscriptions*, V, pp. 83 ff.
9. *Loc. cit.*
10. *CA*, pp. 245-46; cf. *ibid.*, p. 130.

king Yaśovarman of Kanauj who is known to have overrun almost the whole of India. We shall discuss the relation of Yaśovarman with Rajasthan later.

In support of his contention that Bappā was Kālabhoja of inscription, Ojha has pointed out that Nainsī's *Khyāt*[1] and the *Rājapraśasti*[2] inform us that Khummāṇa was the son of Bappā while the Aṭpur inscription[3] makes the former the son of Kālabhoja.[4] With the help of *Ekaliṅgamāhātmya* and other sources[5] Ojha assumes that Kālabhoja or Bappā ruled from V.S. 791 to 810 (=734-753 A.D.)[6] But other scholars such as D.R. Bhandarkar[7] and D. Sharma[8] do not subscribe to this view. According to D. Sharma it is more prudent to rely on the official Kumbhalgarh inscription of V.S. 1517 (=1460 A.D.),[9] of the reign of Mahārāṇā Kumbhakarṇa and professedly based on many earlier *praśastis*, rather than to believe a literary work composed in the same period.[10] The capture of Chitor by Bappā[11] after 713 A.D.[12] is also a later legend. With the exception of the *Rājapraśasti* of V.S. 1732 (=1675 A.D.)[13] not a single epigraph associates Bappā with the capture of Chitor. Abul-Fazl was also unaware of this tradition.[14] It may be proved with the help of contemporary epigraphs that Mauryas (Moris) continued to rule over Chitor even after

1. Nainsī, *Khyāt*, Patra, II, p. 1.
2. *EI*, XXIX-XXX.
3. *IA*, XXXIX (1910), pp. 190 ff.
4. Ojha, *op. cit.*, p. 409.
5. *Ibid.*, pp. 410.414.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 414.
7. *IA*, XXXIX (1910) pp. 190 ff.
8. *RTA*, I, pp. 238-241.
9. *EI*, XXIV, pp. 314 ff.
10. *RTA*, I, p. 240.
11. Nainsī, *Khyāt*, Patra, I, p. 2.
12. Cf. Ojha, G.H., *op. cit.*, pp. 408 ff.; Tod, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 919-22, *Rājasth¯na Bhāratī*, year 9, II, pp. 30-31; [*CA*, p. 163; Sharma, G.N., ... *e Itihāsa ke Srota*, pt. I, pp. 51-52.

753 A.D., the supposed date of Bappā's abdication.[1] According to Dasharatha Sharma, the first Guhila prince who is definitely known to have possessed Chitor was Jaitrasiṁha (c. 1213-1253 A.D).[2] Therefore, G.C. Raychaudhuri seems to be correct in his conclusion that the tradition of Bappā's occupation of Chitor was fabricated in the seventeenth century.[3] Further, against the view of Ojha it can also be shown that several *praśastis* found from Chitor,[4] Abu[5] and Ranakapur[6] mention Bappā and Kālabhoja together as separate individuals.

Kālabhoja was succeeded by his son Khummāṇa I.[7] He evidently flourished in the first half of the eighth century A.D. This was the period when the Arabs invaded Sindh and parts of Rajasthan. Therefore, it is quite likely that Khummāṇa achieved some success against them.[8] He was identified by D.R. Bhandarkar[9] and R.C. Majumdar.[10] with Bappā Rāwal. Bhandarkar abandoned his theory later on,[11] but it is still adhered to by Majumdar. Bhandarkar calculated that the average reign period of individual rulers between Aparājita (661 A.D.) and Allaṭa (953 A.D.) comes to a little more than 24 years. Therefore, accepting 753 A.D. as the correct year for the abdication of Bappā, Bhandarkar identified him with Khummāṇa, the fourth ruler from Aparājita. But, as pointed by Dasharatha Sharma, this view is "not only against tradition which makes Khummāṇa a son of Bappā, but might be wrong

1. For details see *PIHC*, 1960, pt. I, pp. 86 ff; *JOI*, X, pp. 31-33; *RTA*, I, pp. 226-228.
2. *RTA*, I, p. 240.
3. *History of Mewar*, p. 31.
4. *Bhavanagar Inscriptions*, IV, pp. 74 ff.
5. *Ibid.*, V, pp. 83 ff.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 114; Sharma, G.N., *Rājasthāna ke Itihāsa ke Srota*, pp. 139-41.
7. *Cf IA*, XXXIX, pp. 190 ff.
8. Cf. Raychaudhuri, G.C., *op. cit.*, p. 32.
9. *Loc. cit.*
10. *CA*, p. 159.
11. From Bhandarkar's list of North Indian inscriptions it appears that he later identified Bappā with Khummāṇa's grandson, Siṁha.

otherwise too, for sometime the total of three reigns can be one hundred years or more."[1]

Thus no solution of the identification of Bappā Rāwal seems to be acceptable to the majority of scholars. Actually his personality is so much mixed up with myths, legends and folklore that now it has become extremely difficult to visualise even its bare outlines. Modern historians, who are somewhat influenced by their nationalistic fervour, try to reconstruct his history with these legends and make the confusion worst confounded. He is regarded as one of the greatest Mahārājādhirāja of his times, at least of Rajasthan, if not of the whole of India, though the subsequent history of the Guhilas i.e. the history of the period after 753 A.D. (when the age of Bappā Rāwal had definitely come to an end) does not indicate that they had achieved very remarkable successes in the preceding epoch. To us it appears that Bappā may be partly a legendary figure in the sense that his personality, as known to us, is composed of the stories which became current as a result of the achievements of several rulers of the Guhila family. It must be remembered that Bappā is possibly not an individual name but an honorific title and, therefore, the possibility cannot be ruled out that it was applied to more than one kings.[2] It is quite likely that the bardic tradition, according to which Bappā captured Chitor after repulsing the *mlechchhas* who had attacked the Mori kingdom, contains an echo of Khummāṇa's successful fight against the Arabs. His success was probably due as much to his valour as to the natural strategic advantages of the territory over which he ruled.

The immediate successors of Khummāṇa I, namely Mattaṭa, Bhartṛipaṭṭa, Siṁha, etc., who flourished in the later half of the eighth century A.D. had to accept the overlordship of the imperial Pratīhāras. Their history does not fall within the scope of the present work.

1. *RTA*, I, p. 239.
2. Cf. the evolution of the Vikramāditya legend, *supra*, Ch. II, App.

The Guhilas of Chātsu

In addition to the Guhila family of Medapāṭa there was another Guhila dynasty which flourished in the post-Harsha period. It ruled over an extensive region in the Jaipur-Udaipur division. The founder of this dynasty was Bhartṛipaṭṭa who may be placed in the last decades of the sixth century or the beginning of the seventh century A.D. The early history of his family is known from two inscriptions, one found at Chātsu,[1] a town 26 miles to the north of Jaipur, and the other, dated V.S. 741 (684 A.D.), at Nagar,[2] in the Uniyara Tehsil of the old Jaipur state. Both the places are separated from each other by about 50 miles. According to the Chāṭsu epigraph, Bhartṛipaṭṭa, the founder of the family, was like Rāma (obviously Paraśurāma) endowed with both priestly and martial qualities (*Brahmakshatrānvita*). As is generally accepted, it means that just as Paraśurāma was a Brāhmaṇa by caste, but performed the feats of a Kshatriya, Bhartṛipaṭṭa also was Brāhmaṇa by birth but followed the vocation of Kshatriyas.[3] Incidentally, it is an additional proof of the Brāhmana origin of the Guhilas. Almost nothing is known about the next three rulers, viz. Iśānabhaṭa, Upandrabhaṭa and Guhila I. Guhila's son Dhanika is also known from the Nagar record mentioned. above. It was during his reign that a step-well was constructed at Nagar in V.S. 741 (684 A.D.) 'for the use of his subjects, for the performance of the *Abhisheka* of Śaṅkara and for the acquisition of religious merit.'[4] D.R. Bhandarkar[5] identified him with the ruler of the same name known to us from the Dabok (a village 8 miles to the east of Udaipur) inscription of the time of Dhavalappadeva.[6] Bhandarkar read the date of the Dabok record as 407 and referred it to the Gupta Era (A.D. 725).[7] But R.R. Halder reads it as 207 and refers it to

1. *EI*, XII, pp. 10-17.
2. *Bhārata-Kaumudī*, I, pp. 267 ff.
3. Cf. *EI*, XII, p. 11; *CA*, p. 160.
4. *Bhārata-Kaumudī*, I, p. 269.
5. *EI*, XII, pp. 11-12.
6. *Ibid*, XX, pp. 122-125.
7. *Ibid.*, XII, pp. 11-12.

the Harsha Era (A.D. 813).[1] R.C. Majumdar is inclined to accept the former reading.[2] He has rightly argued that Dhanika "could not have flourished in 207 H.E. (813 A.D.) as Harsharāja, fourth in descent from him, was contemporary of Pratīhāra Bhoja I".[3] According to the Dabok inscription Dhanika ruled over Dhavagartā i.e. Dhoḍ in the Jahajpur district of the former Udaipur state which was probably the capital of this dynasty.[4] He was a feudatory of the Paramabhaṭṭāraka Mahārājādhirāja Parameśvara Śrī Dhavalappadeva. According to D.R. Bhandarkar, this Dhavalappadeva should be identified with the Maurya ruler named Dhavala mentioned in the Kanaswa (old Kota state) inscription of V.S. 795 (738 A.D.).[5] The suggestion, if correct, would indicate that the Guhilas of Chāṭsu were the feudatories of the Mauryas of the Udaipur region. R.C. Majumdar even goes a step further and suggests that the main branch of the Guhilots was also a feudatory of the Mauryas and Bappā founded an independent state on the ruins of the Maurya kingdom when it was destroyed by the Arabs.[6] Dasharatha Sharma, however, doubts the validity of the identification of the two Dhanikas. According to him as since Dhavalappadeva is not mentioned in the Nagar inscription as Dhanika's sovereign, the latter cannot be identified with Dhanika, the feudatory of Dhavalappadeva.[7] Against this argument it may be suggested that Dhanika of Nagar record could have accepted the overlordship of Dhavalappa Maurya after 684 A.D. If such was the case he obviously could not mention the Maurya Mahārājādhirāja in his earlier document.

The subsequent history of this branch of the Guhilas does not concern us as it belongs to the period when the Pratīhāras of Jalor became an imperial power and the Guhilas were forced to accept their overlordship.

1. *EI*, XX, pp. 122 ff.
2. *CA*, p. 160 fn. 2.
3. *Loc. cit.*
4. *EI*, XII, p. 12.
5. *IA*, XIX, pp. 55 ff; Tod, J., *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan*, II, p. 917.
6. *CA*, p. 158.
7. *RTA*, p. 212.

The Mauryas of Mewar

In the seventh century or in the beginning of the eighth century, the Mauryas, evidently the same as the Mori Rajputs, had a strong principality in S. E. Rajasthan. They were perhaps the most prominent power in this region before the Pratihāras achieved imperial status. There is still a sub-clan of the Paramāras known as Morya or Maurya.[1] Whether the Mori Rajputs were connected with the imperial Mauryas, is difficult to determine in the present state of our knowledge. Their existence in this area is proved by the bardic tradition as well as several documents, but a connected account of their history with the help of these materials cannot be reconstructed. According to the bardic tradition, the Guhilot ruler Bappā conquered Chitor from the Mori king Manurāja.[2] This Manurāja has been identified by Tod with the king Maun of an inscription published by him in his *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan.*[3] He was preceded by three rulers, viz., Māheśvara, Bhīma and Bhoja. Bhīma is said to have been the ruler of Avantipura and a great warrior. His grandson Maun was the builder of the Mānasarovara lake. A certain king Mānabhaṅga is also mentioned in an inscription found at Shankarghatta. This record, dated V.S. 770 (=713 A.D.) describes him as a builder of magnificent palace and tanks, etc. at Chitor.[4] The association of the Mauryas with Chitor is also indicated by the tradition which attributes the construction of Chitrāṅga tank to Chitrāṅgada Maurya. As the tank finds mention in a Chitor epigraph of V.S. 1344 (1287 A.D.),[5] the tradition may

1. Tod, James, *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan*, Vol. I, p. 265, fn. 3.
2. *Nainsī, Khyāt*, Patra, 1, p. 2; Ojha, G.H., *History of Rajasthan*, Vol. II, p. 408; Tod, *op. cit.*, pp. 265-66; *CA*, p. 158.
3. Tod, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 919-22, Because of its weight the original stone on which this record was engraved had to be thrown into the sea by Tod when he was on his way to England.
4. *Rājasthāna Bhāratī*, year 9, II, pp. 30-31. Dasharatha Sharma (*RTA*, pp. 296-7) wrongly believes that the Tod inscription is also dated M.E. 770 (713 A.D.).
5. Sharma, G.N., *Rājasthāna ke Itihāsa ke Srota*, p. 118.

related with each other and had formed a confederacy. The Gurjaras of Nāndīpurī are nowhere called Pratīhāras and the Pratīhāras of Māṇḍavyapura are nowhere called Gurjaras. Further, whether the imperial Gurjara Pratīhāras belonged to Malwa, as Majumdar believes, is also a most debated point.[1] "To speak of Śiluka of the Mandor Pratīhāra family as the head of a Gurjara confederacy, therefore, can hardly be regarded as justified ; it needs much of evidence than the theoretical hypothesis put forward by Dr. Majumdar."[2]

From the Jodhpur inscription it appears that Śiluka was a religious-minded person. He not only founded a town but also excavated a tank and constructed a lofty temple of Siddheśvara Mahādeva at a holy place called Tretā.[3] But whether his reign ended peacefully or not is doubtful. We know that either he or his successor was on the throne when the Arabs invaded Rajasthan and Gujarat and advanced as far as Ujjayinī. The Arab general Junaid conquered Bailman and Jurz and raided Marmad Mandal and Barus. Of these Marmad was most likely included is Śiluka's kingdom.[4] However, the credit of hurling the invaders back and saving western India from them belongs to Nāgabhaṭa I, the imperial Pratīhāra ruler, and Avanijanāśraya Pulakeśirāja, the Chālukya king of Lāṭa (South Gujarat). We shall have occasion to refer to the achievements of these rulers later.

The history of Śiluka's immediate successors Jhoṭa (the son of Śiluka), Bhillāditya (the son of the former) and Kakka (the son of Bhillāditya and the father of Bāuka and (Kakkuka) is neither known in detail nor does it concern us; for it belongs to the period when the imperial Pratīhāras had become para-

1. Cf. *RTA*, I, pp. 108 ff, 218.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 218.
3. पुष्करिणी कारिता येन त्रेतातीर्थे च पत्तनम् ।
   सिद्धेश्वरो महादेवः कारितस्तुंगमंदिरः ॥२०॥
   Pandey, R.B., *op. cit.*, p. 160.
4. *EI*, IX, p. 278; cf. *EI*, XVIII, pp. 87 ff.

of the Umbrella.[1] He has been called *Valla-maṇḍala-pālaka.*[2] Although the exact significance of this statement of the Jodhpur record is not certain, yet it appears that Śiluka achieved some success against neighbouring powers. Perhaps the Pratīhāra principality was very often raided by the people from the neighbouring Valla state. According to R.C. Majumdar, "if Stravaṇī be regarded as identical with Taban of the Arab writers which probably consisted of a part of the Panjab just to the north-west of Rajputana, Śiluka's kingdom must have roughly corresponded to modern Jodhpur and Bikaner. The Bhaṭṭi king Devarāja was probably the ruler of the Bhaṭṭi clan who occupied Jaisalmer, and by defeating him Śiluka established his supremacy in Rajputana."[3] Dasharatha Sharma broadly concurs with Majumdar but on the question of the interpretation of another passage of the epigraph he disagrees with the latter.[4] Any way, it is certain that Śiluka's success against the Bhaṭṭi king gave him a safe frontier on the northern as well as the north-western side of the Pratīhāra kingdom. According to Majumdar, the title *Valla-maṇḍala-pālaka* presumably refers to a confederacy of states of which Śiluka was the recognised head.[5] This view is based on the assumption that the Pratīhāras of Mandor were Gurjaras and were a branch of the same horde to which the Gurjaras of Nāndīpurī and the Gurjara Pratīhāras of Malwa (i.e. the imperial Pratīhāras) belonged. But, as we have already seen,[6] there is no reason to believe that these three dynasties were racially

1. ततः श्रीशिलुको जातः पुत्त्रो दुर्व्वारविक्कमः ।
येन सीमा कृता नित्या स्त्रवणीवल्लदेशयोः ॥८॥
भट्टिकं देवराजं यो वल्लमण्डलपालकं(:) ।
निपात्य तत्क्षणं भूमौ प्राप्तवानृच्छत्रचिह्नकं(:) ॥१९॥

—*loc. cit.*

2. *Loc. cit.*
3. *CA*, p. 154.
4. Cf. *RTA*, I, p. 217 fn. 1.
5. *CA*, p. 154.
6. *Supra*, Ch. IV.

related with each other and had formed a confederacy. The Gurjaras of Nāndīpurī are nowhere called Pratīhāras and the Pratīhāras of Māṇḍavyapura are nowhere called Gurjaras. Further, whether the imperial Gurjara Pratīhāras belonged to Malwa, as Majumdar believes, is also a most debated point.[1] "To speak of Śiluka of the Mandor Pratīhāra family as the head of a Gurjara confederacy, therefore, can hardly be regarded as justified ; it needs much of evidence than the theoretical hypothesis put forward by Dr. Majumdar."[2]

From the Jodhpur inscription it appears that Śiluka was a religious-minded person. He not only founded a town but also excavated a tank and constructed a lofty temple of Siddheśvara Mahādeva at a holy place called Tretā.[3] But whether his reign ended peacefully or not is doubtful. We know that either he or his successor was on the throne when the Arabs invaded Rajasthan and Gujarat and advanced as far as Ujjayinī. The Arab general Junaid conquered Bailman and Jurz and raided Marmad Mandal and Barus. Of these Marmad was most likely included is Śiluka's kingdom.[4] However, the credit of hurling the invaders back and saving western India from them belongs to Nāgabhaṭa I, the imperial Pratīhāra ruler, and Avanijanāśraya Pulakeśirāja, the Chālukya king of Lāṭa (South Gujarat). We shall have occasion to refer to the achievements of these rulers later.

The history of Śiluka's immediate successors Jhoṭa (the son of Śiluka), Bhillāditya (the son of the former) and Kakka (the son of Bhillāditya and the father of Bāuka and (Kakkuka) is neither known in detail nor does it concern us; for it belongs to the period when the imperial Pratīhāras had become para-

1. Cf. *RTA*, I, pp. 108 ff, 218.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 218.
3. पुष्करिणी कारिता येन त्रेतातीर्थे च पत्तनम् ।
सिद्धेश्वरो महादेवः कारितस्तुंगमंदिरः ॥२०॥
Pandey, R.B., *op. cit.*, p. 160.
4. *EI*, IX, p. 278; cf. *EI*, XVIII, pp. 87 ff.

of the Umbrella.[1] He has been called *Vall*
Although the exact significance of this statem
pur record is not certain, yet it appears that
some success against neighbouring powers. P
hāra principality was very often raided by the
neighbouring Valla state. According to R.C
Stravaṇī be regarded as identical with Tab
writers which probably consisted of a part o
to the north-west of Rajputana, Śiluka's king
roughly corresponded to modern Jodhpur an
Bhaṭṭi king Devarāja was probably the ruler o
who occupied Jaisalmer, and by defeating hi
shed his supremacy in Rajputana."[3] Dash
broadly concurs with Majumdar but on the
interpretation of another passage of the epigr
with the latter.[4] Any way, it is certain that
against the Bhaṭṭi king gave him a safe frontier
as well as the north-western side of the Pra
According to Majumdar, the title *Valla-ma*
sumably refers to a confederacy of states of
the recognised head.[5] This view is based on
that the Pratīhāras of Mandor were Gurj
branch of the same horde to which the Gurja
and the Gurjara Pratīhāras of Malwa (i.e. th
hāras) belonged. But, as we have already se
reason to believe that these three dynasti

1. ततः श्रीशिलुको जातः पुत्त्रो दुर्व्वारविक्क्रमः ।
येन सीमा कृता नित्या स्त्रवणीवल्लदेशयोः ॥८॥
भट्टिकं देवराजं यो वल्लमण्डलपालकं(:) ।
निपात्य तत्क्षणं भूमौ प्राप्तवानृच्छत्रचिह्नकं(:) ॥९

—*loc. cit.*

2. *Loc. cit.*
3. *CA*, p. 154.
4. Cf. *RTA*, I, p. 217 fn. 1.
5. *CA*, p. 154.
6. *Supra*, Ch. IV.

Buddhist fifth columnists and the operation of certain other factors made the position of Muhammed strong. According to *Chach nāmā* or *Tarikh-Hind wa Sindh*[1] in the battle of Raor (Rawar) on Thursday, the 10th Ramazan in the year 93 (June, 712 A.D.) Dāhar, who fought with valour and nearly succeeded in routing the Muslim army, suddenly died in the battle-field. It disheartened his men and officers.[2] Jaisiṁha (Jaisiya), the son of Dāhar, retreated to Brahmanabad but ultimately both Brahmanabad and the capital city Alor fell to the enemy despite the fact that people of these cities fought bravely.[3]

Meanwhile the internal politics of the Caliphate was fast changing. The death of Hajjāj in 714 A.D. and that of Caliph Walīd in the following year brought evil days for Muhammad-bin-Qasim.[4] The new Caliph Sulaiman (715-717 A.D.) was an enemy of Hajjāj. He wreaked vengeance on the members of Hajjāj's family. Muhammad was recalled to Iraq where he was put to death by torture.[5] Caliph Umar II (717-720) offered virtual independence to Indian princes on condition of their accepting Islam.[6] Jaisiṁha accepted the offer, but during the Caliphate of Hishām (A.D. 724-743) he apostatized and declared war against Junaid, the Arab governor of Sindh. However, Junaid defeated him and took him prisoner.[7]

Junaid carried the Muslim arms into the interiors of India. According to the *Futuhu-i-Buldan* of Al Biladuri "He (Junaid) then sent his officer to Marmad Mandal, Dahnaj; and Barus (Broach)... He sent a force against Uzain and he also sent Habid, son of Marra, with an army against the country of Māliba. They made incursion against Uzain, and they attacked Baharīmad and burnt its suburbs. Junaid conquered at Bailamān and Jurz."[8] Most of these places have been

1. For details, Muhammad bin Kasim Sakifi, pp. 131-211.
2. *Ibid.*, pp. 170-71.
3. *Ibid.*, pp. 171 ff.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 437.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 439; cf. *CHI*, III, pp. 7-8; *CA*, p. 172.
6. Elliot and Dowson, *op. cit.*, p. 440.
7. *Ibid.* pp. 125-26, 441-42.
8. *Ibid.*, pp. 126, 441-42.

satisfactorily identified. Barus or Barwas is definitely Broach and Bailmān stands for Bhillamāla[1] (Bhinmal) while the kingdom of Jurz is evidently identical with some Gurjara principality.[2] Māliba and Uzain no doubt stand for Malwa and its capital city Ujjain[3] and Marmad for Maru-Māra, corresponding to Jaisalmer and part of Jodhpur. Thus it would appear that the Arabs advanced as far as Broach in the south and Malwa in the west and also penetrated deep into Rajasthan. The Navsari Plates of Chālukya Avanijanāśraya Pulakeśirāja of Lāṭa (c. 738 A,D.) also speak of the defeat of the kings of the Saindhavas, the Kachchhellas, Saurāshṭra, the Chāvoṭakas, the Mauryas and the Gurjaras by the Tajikas, i.e., the Arabs.[4] The two accounts agree remarkably, excepting that Saurāshṭra, denoting the Valabhī kingdom, is not included in the Arab account.[5] These expeditions took place in the second quarter of the eighth century. They were successful at least temporarily but very soon Nāgabhaṭa I, the imperial Pratīhāra ruler and Avanijanāśraya Pulakeśirāja, Chālukya ruler of Lāṭa, checked the victorious advance of the Arabs. According to the Chālukya records the valorous stand taken by Pulakeśirāja earned him the titles "solid pillar of Dakshiṇāpatha" and "the repeller of the unrepellable".[6] As regards Nāgabhaṭa I, it is usually admitted that it was this success of the Pratihāra ruler against the Arabs which enhanced his power and glory and led his family to make an attempt for imperial status.

Invasions of Yaśovarman of Kanauj and Lalitāditya Muktāpīḍa of Kashmir

In the first half of the eighth century A.D. Rajasthan had to face not only the invasion of the Arabs but also of

1. According to R.C. Majumdar (*CA*, pp. 154, 172) Bailmān stands for Vallamaṇḍalà of Jodhpur inscription of Bāuka.
2. Cf. Elliot and Dowson, *op. cit.*, pp. 354-60.
3. *CA*, p. 172.
4. *Bhandarkar List*, No. 1220; cf. *ABORI*, X, p. 31.
5. *CA*, p. 173.
6. *Bhandarkar List*, No. 1220; *ABORI*, X, p. 31.

two indigenous powers. They were, Yaśovarman of Kanauj and Lalitāditya Muktāpīḍa of Kashmir. The exploits of Yaśovarman have been described in a contemporary Prakṛit work called the *Gauḍavaho* which was composed by his court poet Vākpati. This work was planned on an enormous scale but on the whole contains "as little history as possible"[1] Some additional light on Yaśovarman's career is thrown by Kalhaṇa's *Rājataraṅgiṇī* and Jain works such as the *Prabhāvakacharita*, the *Prabandha kosha*, and the *Bappabhaṭṭasūricharita*. We also have an inscription written in high-flown Sanskrit from Nalanda which belongs to the reign of Yaśovarman. It was engraved by Mālada, the son of a minister of this ruler.[2]

The antecedents and early history of this king are shrouded in considerable mystery. Vākpati informs us that his patron was "an ornament to the lunar race of kings"[3] while *Bappabhaṭṭasūricharita*[4] and the *Prabhāvakacharita*[5] make him a descendent of Chandragupta Maurya. It is quite likely that he belonged to the Maukhari family which the later Jain writers mistakenly identified with the Maurya dynasty[6]

Vākpati gives a detailed account of *vijaya yātrā* of Yaśovarman in a manner of the *digvijaya* of a mythical world-conqueror, but nowhere does he refer to the defeated kings by their names, not even to the king of Gauḍa, though the

1. Keith, A.B., *A History of Sanskrit Literature*, p. 160.
2. *EI*, XX, pp. 37 ff. Hirananda Sastri, the editor of this inscription, wrongly identified the king Yaśovarmmadeva of this record with Yaśodharman of the Mandasor inscriptions. For an analysis of different views on this point vide, Tripathi, R.S., *History of Kanauj*, pp. 205-207.
3. *Gauḍa-Vaho* (S.P. Pandit's ed.) verses, 1064-65.
4. *JBBRAS*, Vol. III, 1928, pp. 103, 314.
5. *Prabhāvakacharita*, XI, verses 46-47, p. 131 (H.M. Sarma's ed. Bombay, 1909).
6. Cf. Cunningham, A., *Arch. Surv. Ind. Rep*, XV, p. 164; Pires, E.A., *The Maukharis*, pp. 136-137; Ray, N., *Calcutta Review*, Feb., 1928, p. 216. Cf. the case of Pūrṇavarman of Magadha who, according to Yuan Chwang (Beal, S., *Buddhist Records of the Western World*, II, p. 218) was a Maurya, though from circumstantial evidence it appears that he was a Maukhari. For a detailed analysis of this problem vide, Goyal, S.R., *PRHC*, X, 1972, pp. 16 ff.

any specific information. They were supplanted at Kanauj by the kings of the Āyudha dynasty which was overthrown by the imperial Pratīhāras in the beginning of the ninth century A.D.

The Rise of the Imperial Pratīhāras

The rise of the imperial Pratīhāras marked a turning point in the history of North India in general and Rajasthan in particular. In the Gwalior *praśasti* of Mihirabhoja[1] they claim descent from Lakshmaṇa, the younger brother of Rāma.[2] Further, this record describes Vatsarāja as foremost amongst the most distinguished Kshatriyas and as one who stamped the noble race of Ikshvāku with his own name by virtue of his blameless conduct.[3] This claim is further strengthened by Rājaśekhara who calls his patron Mahendrapāla *Raghukula-tilaka* i.e., ornament of the race of Raghu,[4] and "Raghugrāmaṇī" or leader of Raghu family[5] and Mahīpāla as "Raghuvaṁśamuktāmaṇi" or 'the pearl jewel of the lineage of Raghu.'[6] Thus there can be hardly any doubt that the imperial Pratīhāras looked upon themselves as Kshatriyas of the solar race. The theory that they were foreigners and belonged to the Gurjara race is not favoured by competent authorities now.

1. *EI*, XVIII, pp. 99-114; Pandey, R.B., *Historical and Literary Inscriptions*, pp. 162-166.
2. श्लाघ्यस्तस्यानुजोऽसौ मघवमदमुषो मेघनादस्य संख्ये
सौमित्रिस्तीव्रदण्डः प्रतिहरणविधेर्यः प्रतीहार आसीत्
—Pandey, *op. cit.*, p. 162, verse, 3, Cf. *EI*, XVIII, pp. 110-111, fn. 5.
3. एकः क्षत्रियपुङ्गवेषु च यशोगुर्वीं धुरं प्रोद्वह-
न्निक्ष्वाकोः कुलमुन्नतं सुचरितैश्चक्रे
स्वनामांकितं
—Pandey, *op. cit.*, p. 161, verse, 7.
4. रघुकुलतिलको महेन्द्रः
—*Viddhaśālabhañjikā*, ed. Atre. Canto I, stanza 5.
5. देवो महेन्द्रपालनृपतिः शिष्यो रघुग्रामणिः
—*Bālabhārata*, Canto I, stanza ii.
6. *Ibid.*, canto I, stanza ii.

Marudeśa. But Lalitāditya succeeded "in creating a river in the Maru land" and thus save his army.[1] Whatever the element of truth in this episode, it certainly indicates that like Yaśovarman, Lalitāditya also claimed some sort of success in western Rajasthan.

The dates of the invasions of Yaśovarman and Lalitāditya of Rajasthan depend upon the dates of the latter which may be determined with the help of internal evidence of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* and the Chinese sources. According to the data furnished by the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, Lalitāditya flourished 455 years, 7 months and 11 days before the reign of Jayasiṁha, the patron of Kalhaṇa.[2] On the basis of this fact, it has been calculated that Lalitāditya ascended the throne in 693 A.D. and ruled upto 730 A.D.[3] But from the Chinese sources it appears that Chandrāpīḍa, the second predecessor of Lalitāditya sent an emissary to China in 713 A.D. and received investiture as king from the Emperor of China in 720 A.D. whereas, according to Kalhaṇa's chronology, Chandrāpīḍa was already dead in 689 A.D.[4] Therefore, there is a mistake of at least 31 years in Kalhaṇa's calculation. Hence Lalitāditya's accession cannot be placed earlier than 724 A.D. In that case Yaśovarman will have to be assigned to the middle of the eighth century. According to the Jain writers also Yaśovarman was ruling in in V.S. 800 (743 A.D). Further, Rajaśekhara (the author of *Prabandhakosha*) states that Bappabhaṭṭi, who was initiated as a Jain monk in 750 A.D., converted Āmarāja, the son and successor of Yaśovarman, to Jainism, apparently after this date. It proves that Yaśovarman must have died in or shortly before 750 A.D.[5] The conquest of Rajasthan by Lalitāditya must also have taken place in this general period.

Nothing is known about the successors of Yaśovarman. At least they do not seem to have any thing to do with Rajasthan. They are mentioned by the Jain writers but without

1. *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, Bk. IV, verses 282-306.
2. *Gauḍavaho*, S.P. Pandit ed., Introduction, pp. LXXXVI-XCII.
3. Cf. Tripathi, R.S., *History of Kanauj*, p. 191; *CA*, p. 135 fn. 1.
4. Cf. Tripathi, R.S., *op. cit.*, p. 196.
5. Cf. *Collected works of Sir R.G. Bhandarkar*, Vol. II, pp. 429 ff.

any specific information. They were supplanted at Kanauj by the kings of the Āyudha dynasty which was overthrown by the imperial Pratihāras in the beginning of the ninth century A.D.

The Rise of the Imperial Pratīhāras

The rise of the imperial Pratīhāras marked a turning point in the history of North India in general and Rajasthan in particular. In the Gwalior *praśasti* of Mihirabhoja[1] they claim descent from Lakshmaṇa, the younger brother of Rāma.[2] Further, this record describes Vatsarāja as foremost amongst the most distinguished Kshatriyas and as one who stamped the noble race of Ikshvāku with his own name by virtue of his blameless conduct.[3] This claim is further strengthened by Rājaśekhara who calls his patron Mahendrapāla *Raghukula-tilaka* i.e., ornament of the race of Raghu,[4] and "Raghugrāmaṇī" or leader of Raghu family[5] and Mahīpāla as "Raghu-vaṁśamuktāmaṇi" or 'the pearl jewel of the lineage of Raghu.'[6] Thus there can be hardly any doubt that the imperial Pratīhāras looked upon themselves as Kshatriyas of the solar race. The theory that they were foreigners and belonged to the Gurjara race is not favoured by competent authorities now.

1. *EI*, XVIII, pp. 99-114; Pandey, R.B., *Historical and Literary Inscriptions*, pp. 162-166.
2. श्लाघ्यस्तस्यानुजोऽसौ मघवमदमुषो मेघनादस्य संख्ये सौमित्रिस्तीव्रदण्डः प्रतिहरणविधेर्यः प्रतीहार आसीत् ।
—Pandey, *op. cit.*, p. 162, verse, 3, Cf. *EI*, XVIII, pp. 110-111, fn. 6.
3. एकः क्षत्रियपुङ्गवेषु च यशोगुर्वीं धुरं प्रोद्वह-न्निक्ष्वाकोः कुलमुन्नतं सुचरितैश्चक्रे स्वनामांकितं
—Pandey, *op. cit.*, p. 161, verse, 7.
4. रघुकुलतिलको महेन्द्रः
—*Viddhaśālabhañjikā*, ed. Atre. Canto I, stanza 5.
5. देवो महेन्द्रपालनृपतिः शिष्यो रघुग्रामणीः
—*Bālabhārata*, Canto I, stanza 11.
6. *Ibid.*, canto I, stanza 11.

The term 'Gurjara' in this period had a geographical connotation and a racial one.[1]

The early history of the imperial Pratīhāra family is known mainly from the Gwalior *praśasti* of Mihirabhoja. Unfortunately, it does not mention the original home of this dynasty. According to R.C. Majumdar and many others, the dynasty belonged to western Malwa and had its capital at Ujjain (ancient Ujjayinī)[2] This is sought to be proved with the help of the colophon to the Jain *Harivaṁśa Purāṇa* of Jinasena which mentions Vatsarāja as the king of Avanti.[3] Further support for this theory is provided by the Sanjan plates of Amoghavarsha I, dated Śaka year 793 (871 A.D.)[4] which refer to the Hiraṇyagarbha *mahādāna* ceremony of Dantidurga Rāshṭrakūṭa at Ujjayinī where the Gurjara lord and others were made door-keepers.[5] But Dasharatha Sharma does not agree with this view. According to him, the translation of the relevant verse of the Jain *Harivaṁśa-Purāṇa* accepted by Majumdar and others is not correct. He thinks it better to take the 'Avantirāja' of this verse as the master of the east (*pūrvva*) and Vatsarāja as the lord of the western quarter (*para*) i.e. Rajasthan.[6] As regards the evidence of the Rāshṭrakūṭa inscriptions, it actually does not prove any thing for it makes all the kings, and not only the Gurjara rulers, as door-keepers in the Hiraṇyagarbha *mahādāna* ceremony of Dantidurga. Dasharatha Sharma has given some very cogent reasons

1. Cf. *Supra*, Ch. IV; *RTA*, I, pp. 108-119.
2. *EI*, XVIII, pp. 99 ff; *JDL*, X, pp. 1-76; Tripathi, R.S., *History of Kanauj*, pp. 225-227; *The Age of the Imperial Kanauj*, pp. 19-24.
3. *Bombay Gazeteer*, 1896, Vol. I, pt. II, p. 197, fn. 2; *IA*, XV, pp. 141-42.
4. *EI*, XVIII, pp. 235-57; Pandey, R.B., *op. cit.*, pp. 245-56.
5. हिरण्यगर्भराजन्यैरुज्जयिन्यां यदासितम् ।
प्रतीहारीकृतं येन गुर्जरेशादिराजकम् ॥
—First plate, Verse 9, Pandey, R.B., *op. cit.*, p. 247.
Cf. the Ellora Daśāvatāra cave temple inscription, *ASI* (*West. Circle*) *Report*. V, p. 88.
6. *RTA*, I, p. 125.

to believe that Jalor in Rajasthan was the original home of the imperial Pratīhāras.[1] The Buchkala inscription of 815 A.D. speaks of the locality as the *sva-vishaya* of Nāgabhaṭa II.[2] The Daulatpura plate Bhojadeva I (V.S. 900=843 A.D.)[3] and the Osia inscription (V.S. 1013=956 A.D.)[4] reveal the fact that the region of Jalor was ruled by the Pratīhāras from the time of, at least, Vatsarāja onwards.[5] On the other hand, Malwa has yielded neither coins nor early inscriptions of the imperial Pratīhāras. Further, the testimony of *ĀMMK* shows that in the first half of the seventh century, Avanti was ruled over by the rulers of Valabhī.[6] Therefore, the Pratīhāras had nothing to do with that region upto that period. Moreover, the *Kuvalayamālākathā* which was composed at Jalor in the reign of Vatsarāja speaks of the Mālava people as darkish in colour, irascible and ferocious.[7] It could not have been the case if Vatsarāja had primarily been a ruler of Malwa. And, lastly, the tradition recorded in the *Purātanaprabandhasaṅgraha* shows that Nāgabhaṭa I established his capital at Jalor.[8] Thus there are ample reasons to assume that the imperial Pratīhāra dynasty originated in the Jalor area of Rajasthan.

The history of the imperial Pratīhāras commences with Nāgabhaṭa I. To use the imagery of the Gwalior *praśasti* Nāgabhaṭa appeared like Nārāyaṇa, in response to the prayer of the oppressed people and crushed the large armies of the powerful Mlechchha king, the destroyer of virtue.[9] Here

1. For detailed analysis vide, *RTA*, I, pp. 121 ff.
2. *EI*, IX, pp. 198 ff.
3. *Ibid.*, V, pp. 208 ff.
4. Sharma, G.N , *Rajasthāna ke Itihāsa ke Srota*, pt. I, p. 63.
5. Cf. *RTA*, I, p. 125.
6. Cf. *PIHC*, 1960, sec. I, Presidential Address.
7. *Kuvalayamālā* (Singhi Jain Granthāvalī, Bombay Edition), lines 2-6, p. 153.
8. *RTA*, I, p. 128; Cf. *Bhāratiya Vidyā*, XVIII, pt. III-IV, pp. 74 ff.
9. तद्वन्शे प्रतिहारकेतनभृतिस्त्रैलोक्यरक्षास्पदे
देवो नागभटः पुरातनमुनेर्मूर्त्तो बभूवाद्भुतम् ।
येनासौ सुकृतप्रमाथिबलवन्म्लेच्छाधिपाक्षौहिणी-
क्षुन्दानस्फुरदुग्रहेतिरुचिरैर्दोर्भिश्चतुर्भिर्वभौ ॥
—Pandey, R.B., *op. cit.*, pp. 162-63, Verse 4.

obviously is a reference to his success against the Arab invaders who had overrun the western borders of India including portions of Rajasthan in the second quarter of the eighth century A.D.[1] It was in the course of his struggle against the Arabs that Nāgabhaṭa carried his victorious arms as far as Broach which was ruled over by his Chāhamāna feudatory Bhartṛivaḍḍha II. According to Dasharatha Sharma, the Sanjan plates appear to have apportioned the main share in the war of liberation against the Arabs to Dantidurga and deliberately under-estimated the contribution of the Pratīhāra king. The circumstantial evidences clearly show that the burden of freeing the country from the Arabs was mainly shouldered by Nāgabhaṭa I and his friends from Rajasthan.

Nāgabhaṭa was able to bequeath his successors a powerful dominion which included Bhillamāla, Lāṭa, Jalor, Abu and probably some other chunks of territory in Rajasthan and central India. Those who regard Malwa as the original homeland of the Pratīhāras include it also within the Pratīhāra kingdom. Nāgabhaṭa is said to have extended his patronage to a Jain scholar named Yakshadeva who has been identified with Kshamāśramaṇa Yakshadatta of the *Kuvalayamālākathā* whose pupils beautified Gurjaradeśa with many temples.[2]

Nāgabhaṭa I was succeeded by his nephew Kakkuka. Excepting the fact that he was a witty person,[3] we know nothing about him. Kakkuka in turn was succeeded by his younger brother, Devarāja or Devaśakti. Gwalior *praśasti* indicates that at some time during his reign the Pratīhāra authority was threatened by external danger. But he seems to have maintained the dignity of the family and paternal kingdom quite intact. According to Dasharatha Sharma, it would be wrong to identify him with Bhaṭṭika of the Jodhpur inscription of Bāuka and conclude that he was defeated by Śiluka of the

1. Cf. Elliot and Dowson, *The History of India*, Vol. I, p. 126.
2. Cf. *Bhāratīya Vidyā*, XVIII, pts. III-IV, pp. 74 ff.
3. Verse 5 of the Gwalior *praśasti*, *loc. cit.*

Pratīhāra family of Mandor.[1] However, his son and successor Vatsarāja (known date 783 A.D.) earned real imperial status for his family.[2] With him the Pratīhāras ceased to be a local power and became a claimant for imperial glory which they

1. *RTA*, I, p. 124 and fn. 2.
2. For detailed study vide, *AIK*, p. 21; *RTA*, I, pp. 124 ff; *History of Kanauj*, pp. 228 ff.

APPENDIX

ORIGIN AND EVOLUTION OF VIKRAMĀDITYA LEGEND

The historicity of Vikramāditya, the greatest and the most remembered royal hero of Indian legends and folklore,[1] has a direct bearing on the history of Rajasthan, especially because he is said to have belonged to the Mālava tribe which occupied the Ajmer-Tonk-Mewar area in the first century B.C. In the preceding pages we have discussed the story of his life as given in the *Kālakāchāryakathānaka.* Apart from it there are numerous stories in Sanskrit, Prakrit and modern Indian languages, all characterised by exaggeration regarding the qualities of the head and heart of this ideal king. These stories deal with the various aspects of his character such as generosity, courage, gallantry, love for the brave, magical powers, patronage of learning, powers of producing excellent literary compositions and evaluating the works of other writers, etc.[2] Tradition has also depicted him as a worker of miracles, a champion of the weak and oppressed, an avenger of insult to the womanhood and an incarnation of courage and daring.[3]

The most important of his factual achievements as described in literature are the following :

The conquest of the whole earth, i.e. India and the adjoining countries including Iran, Ceylon and South-East Asia :[4]

1. Sircar, D.C , *Ancient Malwa and the Vikramāditya Tradition*, Delhi, 1969, p. 106; cf., H.C. Raychaudhuri in the *Vikrama Volume*, Ujjain, 1948, pp. 483 ff.
2. Sircar, *op, cit.*, p. 106. For the analysis of these qualities and achievements, vide, *Vikrama Volume*, pp. 162 ff. and other relevant articles given in this work; also Pandey, R.B., *Vikramāditya* (*Saṁvat-Pravartaka*), Varanasi, 1960, pp. 83 ff. and pp. 224 ff.
3. Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 107.
4. Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 110.

patronage of learning including the fact that his court was graced by the famous *nava ratnas* (nine jewels) viz. Dhanvantari, Kshapaṇaka, Amarasiṁha, Śaṅku, Vetālabhaṭṭa, Ghaṭakarpara, Kālidāsa, Varāhamihira and Vararuchi ;[1]

initiation of the famous Vikrama Saṁvat ;[2] and

extermination of the Śakas which is illustrated by his epithet *Śakāri or Śakadvisha*.[3]

Now the question arises as to how did these legends originate. Whether this king, so lionised by the Indian people, was a historical personage or merely a figment of popular imagination ? And if his historicity is to be believed, when did he flourish ? According to one school of historians there is no reason to doubt the existence of such a ruler and as the era founded by him commenced in 57 B.C., he should be placed in the middle of the century preceding the birth of Jesus Christ. According to their reasoning the traditional account regarding his reign should be accepted unless it is positively opposed to the known facts of history. The late lamented Dr. R.B. Pandey, who championed this view, wrote a full treatise[4] in which he tried to give a detailed picture of the life and times of Vikramāditya on the basis of literary sources of diverse nature. He has accepted almost every fact recorded by tradition as authentic including the supposed contemporaneity of Vikramāditya with the famous nine gems and also the existence of a pan-Indian empire by him in the first century B.C. But the history of India in the first century A.D. as known from inscriptions and coins, the authenticity of which cannot be doubted, precludes any possibility of the existence of such an empire in that period. Therefore a large number of scholars

1. Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 120-21; cf. *Vikrama Volume*, pp. 71-114.
2. For a detailed account vide *Vikrama Volume*, pp. 1-19, 67-69, 115-166, 289-302, 567-586; *AIU*, pp. 124 ff; Sircar, D.C., *Indian Epigraphy*, pp. 219 ff; *Ancient Malwa*. pp. 140 ff.
3. Pandey, R.B., *op. cit.*, pp. 83 ff.
4. *Vikramāditya (Saṁvat-Pravartaka)*.

including R.C. Majumdar,[1] A.S. Altekar,[2] H.C. Raychaudhuri,[3] R.K. Mookerji,[4] D.C. Sircar,[5] S.R. Goyal,[6] etc., do not believe in the historicity of this legendary king. They have usually propounded the view that Vikramāditya, the supposed founder of the Vikrama era, is merely a legend which originated and evolved round the achievements and personality of Chandragupta II Vikramāditya of the imperial Gupta dynasty. Some of these scholars also believe that the accomplishments of the several successors of Chandragupta II also contributed to the evolution of the Vikrama legend. However, many other scholars who do not believe in the traditional view, try to identify the original Vikramāditya either in the personality of Kṛta (the supposed Mālava chief)[7] or Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi[8] or some other ancient Indian ruler of the pre-Gupta age. Now the question arises which of these identifications is correct.

At the very outset we would like to make a general comment on the nature of ancient Indian legends. As is wellknown, our ancestors did not have a modern sense of history, with the result that much of our history is found in the form of legends. Sometime these legends are based on actual historical events and sometime even the germs of actual happenings are completely missing, and the whole thing rests on confusion and misinterpretation of facts. As the mind of the ancients was very credulous, they did not usually hesitate in amplifying and elaborating their legends even with supernatural elements. The legend of Chandragupta Maurya, now called *Chandragupta Kathā*, was based on some historical facts which were later on extremely distorted. The accounts of the Mahābhārata war and the Rāma *Kathā* are also found in quite

1. *Vikrama Volume*, pp. 289 ff.
2. *Ibid.*, pp. 1 ff.
3. *Ibid.*, pp. 483 ff.
4. *Ibid.*, Intro. pp. i-xxvii; pp. 323 ff.
5. *Ancient Malwa*, pp. 106 ff.
6. *HIG*, pp. 248 ff.
7. A.S., Altekar, in the *Vikrama Volume*, pp. 1 ff.
8. Jayaswal, K.P., quoted by R.K. Mookerji in the *Vikrama Volume*, pp. xiii-xiv.

an elaborated form, though it is difficult to determine whether they contain any germs of truth or not. Therefore, while trying to determine the actual amount of truth in the Vikrama *Kathā* one should be on one's guard against pitfalls of exaggeration and the gumble of the unhistorical material with the historical.

It should be quite obvious even to a layman that the veracity of the Vikramāditya legend in its present form is an impossibility. Such a ruler simply could not exist, as is apparent from the complex nature of his personality and achievements. For example, on the one hand the tradition asserts that he was the chief of the Mālava tribe, and on the other, it describes him as a universal ruler. Such a phenomenon was impossible in ancient Indian polity.[1] Even outside India there are extremely few cases in which a republic is known to have succeeded in establishing an empire. Being ruled by the people themselves, republics could not maintain their hold over the subject people. Such a thing was possible only in monarchical or imperial polity. The Roman Republic, no doubt, succeeded in building an empire but that was the result of the unique historical circumstances and political developments spreading over several centuries. Similarly, the success of the Athenian democracy in founding an empire for a short duration was also the result of some very special circumstances, viz., the transformation of the confederacy of Delos by trickery. We do not know any other example in ancient world history in which Vikramāditya legend would have us believe that the tiny Mālava republic of Avanti created a pan-Indian empire under the leadership of its hero Vikramāditya. Incidentally, it may also be noted that the Mālava republic, even in the third century A.D., was confined to the Mālavanagara of Rajasthan where their coins and inscriptions have been discovered. Contrary to this fact the *Vikrama Kathā* presumes that the Mālavas had already occupied Ujjayinī and that it was their capital as early as the first century B.C.

1. Goyal, S.R., *PRHC.* VI, 1973, p. 16.

Let us revert to the contradictions and impossibilities involved in the Vikramāditya legend. In the tradition the king Vikramāditya is described as an impossibly ideal person and ruler. He is the embodiment of all the virtues which the ancient Indian popular mind could imagine. He never shrank from charity to the needy, nor from battle against his enemies. He used to give away freely what was won by courage and endurance. He used his courage for the protection of Dharma and for the destruction of all those who did not tread the path of Dharma. His patronage of learning and love for Sanskrit language and literature has become proverbial. The nine gems who flourished at his court include talents of all types, such as poets, lexicographers, physicians, astronomers and grammarians, etc. In later periods kings and chieftains of India who collected round themselves a group of learned men and poets were compared on that account with Vikramāditya. The great hero is himself depicted as an accomplished poet and writer. In the anthologies, for instance, the *Subhāshitāvali* of Vallabhadeva, *Śārṅgadharapaddhati*, *Vidyākarasahasrakam* of Vidyākaramiśra and the *Saduktikaraṇāmṛita* of Śrīdharadāsa) which have come down to us from the past, contain numerous verses attributed to Vikramāditya. A work on Dhanurveda and a lexicographical work named *Saṁsārāvarta* have also been attributed to him.

A large number of stories are also current which describe Vikramāditya's gallantry, romantic nature and association with *Vetāla Sādhanā*. He is said to have succeeded in acquiring all the eight types of magic power, viz., Aṇimā (Minuteness), Mahimā (Greatness), Laghimā (Lightness), Garimā (Heaviness), Prāpti (Acquisition), Iśitā (Supremacy), *Vetāla sādhanā*.[1]

To us it appears that such a ruler who combined all ese qualities in his personality could not have existed in reality. It seems that here either the virtues of several kings have been combined in the personality of this ideal hero or it is an altogether imaginary picture of what an ideal king

1. *Vikrama Volume*, p. 170

should be. An analysis of the achievements and personalities of the historical Vikramādityas i.e., the Vikramādityas of the Gupta age suggests that probably the former alternative is the correct one.

As is well known, historically, the Imperial Guptas were the earliest kings to assume the title, 'Vikramāditya'. About half a dozen of the Gupta rulers are known to have adopted this *viruda*. On the basis of this fact the Gupta age is sometimes called 'the Age of Vikramādityas'. Till a few years ago Chandragupta II was supposed to be the earliest king to have assumed this title. But now we have at least one coin of Samudragupta also, found in the Bamnala hoard, on the reverse of which this ruler is given the title 'Śrī Vikrama' instead of his usual *viruda* Parākramāṅka. According to Diskalkar[1] and Altekar,[2] and following them many other scholars,[3] this coin was struck during the early reign of Chandragupta II : the old die for the obverse of the coins of Samudragupta being used instead of the die of Chandragupta II's early coin of the 'Archer Type'. But this theory is totally unwarranted. The scepticism of Diskalkar and Altekar follows from the singleness of this coin.[4] They also argue that the Gupta kings usually adopted one *viruda* only. But both these arguments are fallacious. It is one of the fundamental principles of numismatic studies that the evidence of a type, or variety, even if it is known only by one coin, should be accepted unless its acceptance is not incompatible with the definitely known facts of history. The solitary coin of Garuḍadhvaja variety of Kācha[5] and the solitary specimen of the Gaḍahara coin containing the name 'Samudra'[6] provide interestingly close and similar examples. It is also wrong to assume that no Gupta king is known to have used more than one *viruda*. Skandagupta is known to

1. *JNSI*, V, pt. II. 135 ff.
2. *Coinage*, pp. 44-45.
3. Chatterjee, C.D., *Journal of the U.P. Historical Society*, II, p. 23.
4. *JNSI*, XXVII, pt. II, 1965, pp. 142-143.
5. Altekar, A.S., *Coinage*, p. 87.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 52.

have assumed two *virudas*, i.e. Vikramāditya and Kramāditya which, according to Altekar himself, meant two different things.[1] Therefore, there is no valid reason to doubt that Samudragupta also assumed two *virudas* i.e., Parākrama and Vikrama.

Thus Samudragupta becomes the first Indian king to assume the title Vikrama. Here it may be pointed out that his usual title Parākramāṅka is a synonym of Vikramāditya or Vikramāṅka.[2] Following Samudragupta, his son Chandragupta II, latter's grandson Skandagupta (and probably Purugupta also),[3] Purugupta's son Budhagupta and another Gupta king of unknown parentage, Chandragupta III,[4] assumed this title. Thus from c. 350 A.D. to c. 500 A.D north India was ruled by a dynasty whose kings became famous as Vikramādityas. With the passage of time separate entity of such rulers could easily be forgotten by the people. In a society in which scientific history was not known and much of the past was remembered in the form of legends only, such a phenomenon was not impossible. In this situation if we find that most of the elements of the Vikramāditya legend may easily be traced in the lives, achievements and personalities of the Vikramādityas of the Gupta age, the possibility of above hypothesis being correct should be seriously investigated.

Let us begin with Samudragupta. The greatest contribution of the achievements of Samudragupta to the origin and evolution of the Vikramāditya legend belongs to the field of wars and conquests. The detailed description of the *digvijaya* i.e. world-wide conquest of Vikramāditya as found in the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, *Bṛihatkathāmañjarī* and several other medieval works,[5] reminds one of the conquests of Samudragupta. In fact, in the whole annals of ancient Indian history, barring

1. Altekar, A.S. *op. cit.*, p. 256.
2. Cf. that Chandragupta is known to history as Sāhasāṅka also which is a synonym of Vikramāditya.
3. *Coinage*, pp. 255-256; 262-63.
4. Goyal, S.R., *HIG*, p. 372.
5. Cf. Pandey, R.B., *op. cit.*, pp. 12 ff.

Chandragupta Maurya, who obviously could not have anything to do with the legendary Vikramāditya, it is only Samudragupta whose conquests resemble the conquests of Vikramāditya. Though the description of conquests of Vikramāditya as found in early medieval works has become somewhat confused and stereotyped, there are several passages which cannot fail to remind any impartial historian of almost identical, though briefer, passages of the Prayāga *praśasti* of Samudragupta.[1] For example, in the *Kathāsaritsāgara* at one place Vikramāditya is addressed thus :

"You have conquered southern and western regions, Madhyadeśa, Saurāshṭra and the regions to the east of the Gaṅgā. The northern regions and Kashmir have become your tributory states. Various forts and islands have been conquered, the great hordes of the Mlechchhas have been destroyed and other kings have submitted."[2] If this is an idealised description of the actual conquests of a historical king, then it is only Samudragupta to whose conquests it can be traced back. Here the mention of the conquests of the various islands by Vikramāditya may be specially noted. It reminds us of the *sarvvadvīpavāsibhiḥ*, etc., of the Prayāga *praśasti*. In the same work it is said that the kings of Gauḍa, Karṇāṭaka, Lāṭa Kashmir, Sindhu and Iran presented themselves to Vikramāditya[3] i.e., they followed the policy of *ātmanivedana*.[4] Here

1. Sircar, D.C., *SI*, pp. 262 ff.
2. सापरान्तश्च देवेन निर्जितो दक्षिणापथः ।
   मध्यदेशः ससौराष्ट्रः सवंगांगा च पूर्वदिक् ॥
   सकश्मीरा च कौबेरी काष्ठा च करदीकृता ।
   तानि तान्यपि दुर्गाणि द्वीपानि विजितानि च ॥
   म्लेच्छसंघाश्च निहिताः शेषाश्च स्थापिता वशे ।
   ते ते विक्रमशक्तेश्च प्रविष्टाः कटके नृपाः ॥
   KSS, 23, 1, 76-78, as quoted by Pandey, *op. cit.*, App. 3, pp. 250-51.
3. Pandey, R.B., *op. cit.*, p. 99.
4. Sircar, *SI*, p. 266 and fn. 1.

the reference to the submission of the emperor of Iran may be easily compared with the *ātmanivedana* of the *Shāhānushāhi* i.e., the king of Iran, to Samudragupta.[1] The *Kathāsaritsāgara* also refers to the presentation of his daughter by the king of Ceylon to Vikramāditya,[2] which is quite similar to the policy of *Kanyopāyanadāna*[3] followed by the foreign rulers, including the king of Ceylon, by which they tried to please the Gupta emperor.

Thus, the legends regarding the conquests of Vikramāditya and the establishment of an empire by him might have originated from the actual conquests of Samudragupta, though later writers gave an idealised description of them. Similarly, many other elements of the Vikrama tradition may be connected with Samudragupta. The Eran Stone Pillar Inscription[4] refers to his *Suvarṇadāna* i.e., the gift of gold to the Brāhmaṇas. The Prayāga *praśasti* also describes him as a very kind-hearted and generous ruler who was devoted to the betterment of the poor and destitutes.[5] His Nalanda[6] and Gaya[7] Copper Plate inscriptions, of which we possess only later copies,[8] and also the inscriptions of his successors refer to the gift of gold coins and cows which were earned by him in accordance with *nyāya*.[9] It is, therefore, quite possible that the stories regarding the generosity of the legendary Vikramāditya originated with the actual feats of Samudragupta in this field. Here it may also be mentioned that Samudragupta has been described as

1. Goyal, *HIG*, pp. 175-177.
2. Pandey, R.B., *op. cit.*, p. 99.
3. Sircar, *SI*, p. 266.
4. Sircar, *SI.*, pp. 269-270.
5. मृदुहृदयस्यानुकम्पावतो (ऽ) नेक-गो-
शतसहस्र-प्रदायिनः कृपणदीनानाथातुर-
जनोद्धरण

ibid., pp. 266-267.
6. Sircar, *SI.*, pp. 271 ff.
7. *Ibid.*, pp. 273 ff.
8. Goyal, *HIG*, pp. 111 ff.
9. Sircar, *SI.*, p. 321.

the overlord of Śakas and Ujjayinī, the capital of Malwa, was included in his empire.[1] He was also famous as a great patron of learning and literature. His court was graced by Harisheṇa, Vasubandhu the elder,[2] Siddhasena Divākar[3] and also probably Kālidāsa.[4] It is generally believed that Kālidāsa flourished in the Gupta age. Most of the scholars[5] who hold this view place the period of the poet's creative activity in the first half of the fifth century A.D. and suggest that he was patronised by Chandragupta II and Kumāragupta I. But Goyal has given very sound arguments to believe that Kālidāsa flourished in the second half of the fourth century A D. graced the courts of Samudragupta and Chandragupta II.[6]

Samudragupta was succeeded by his elder son Rāmagupta who was overthrown by his younger brother Chandragupta II. There are a number of elements in the Vikrama legend which may be traced in the achievements and personality of Chandragupta II.[7] The most important of them is the extermination of the Śaka kingdom of western India by him, a fact which is known mainly from the numismatic evidence.[8] His association with Ujjayinī, the capital of legendary Vikramāditya is revealed by some early medieval inscriptions and literary works in which he is described 'the lord of the great city of Ujjayinī'.[9] The discovery of the drama *Devīchandragupta* of Viśākhadatta has brought to light a very significant fact which may easily be connected with the evolution of the Vikramāditya saga.[10] In one of the available extracts of this

1. According to a tradition prince Chandragupta II passed the *Kāvyakāra* examination in this city.
2. Goyal, *HIG*, p. 126 f; pp. 214 ff.
3. *Vikrama Volume*, pp. 213-230.
4. Goyal, *HIG*, pp. 217 ff.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 217 fn. 1.
6. *Ibid*, p. 219.
7. For a detailed analysis Vide, *Vikrama Volume*, pp. 223-359, 483-511; Sircar, D C., *Ancient Malwa*, pp. 130 ff.
8. Cf. Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 131, 145 fn. 7.
9. Cf. Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 139-145.
10. Goyal, S.R., *Prāchīna Bhārata kā Rājanītika Itihāsa*, pt. III, p. 166.

drama it is said that when Chandragupta was thinking over the various alternatives of destroying the Śaka king who had besieged the Gupta camp, he contemplated over the possibility of *Vetāla sādhanā* (goblin-worship) also, because with the help of a *Vetāla* the Mlechchha king could easily be killed.[1] This fact has been alluded to in the Rāshṭrakūṭa inscription also. Chandragupta's faith in the efficacy of *Vetāla sādhanā* could have been the original source of the cycle of the legends which culminated in the stories found in the *Vetāla-pañchaviṁśatikā.* Thus a very important element of the Vikrama *Kathā* is directly traceable in the personality and achievements of Chandragupta II Vikramāditya. The fact that Chandragupta II was the patron of Kālidāsa is generally admitted by a large group of Indologists and their contention is too well known to need a repetition.

There are two other elements of the Vikrama legend which might have originated from the personality of Chandragupta II. As we all know the legendary Vikramāditya has been described as the great lover and a husband of a large number of queens, many of whom he won by his valour.[2] We also know that like his father Samudragupta, (who is said to have won the hands of Dattadevī, the mother of Chandragupta II, by paying the price of his personal valour,[3] an additional point of similarity between the personalities of Samudragupta and the legendary Vikramāditya) Chandragupta II was also a great lover and a husband of several queens. One of his queens known from the Vākāṭaka epigraphs was Kuberanāgā, a Nāga princess.[4] It is interesting to note that the *Bṛihatkathāmañjarī* also mentions that Vikramāditya married a Nāga wife.[5] Another queen of Chandragupta II was Dhruvadevī who was, it may be noted, about 15 years junior to Kubera-

1. *EI*, VII, p. 36; XVIII, p. 248.
2. Pandey, R.B., *op. cit.*, p. 79, 147.; cf. *Vikrama Volume*, pp. 173-175.
3. दत्तास्य पौरुष-पराक्रम दत्त-शुल्का...

Eran Stone Pillar Ins., *SI*, p. 269.

4. Sircar, *SI.*, pp. 436-439.
5. *Vikrama Volume*, p. 175.

nāgā and yet was installed as Mahādevī by him. According to S.R. Goyal, Chandragupta II was a middle-aged man when he married Dhruvadevī, the wife of his elder brother Rāmagupta whom he murdered for the sake of the queen and the kingdom.[1] He was very much under the influence of her beauty, so much so that she was entrusted with the administration of a province, a privilege not known to have been accorded to any other Gupta queen.[2] Further, it was her son who became successor of Chandragupta II overriding the claims of the sons of Kuberanāgā.[3] Chandragupta II is also not known to have devoted any attention to the expansion of his empire for several decades after his marriage with Dhruvadevī, probably because, like Pṛithvīrāja and Jahangir, he found greater pleasure in his harem in the enchanting company of his beautiful queen rather than in the dry affairs of statecraft. The fact that he had a romantic nature is also recorded by Viśākhadatta, the author of the *Devīchandragupta* who gives a detailed description of the amorous relationship of Chandragupta II with a maid-servant named Mādhavasenā.[4] It is also not beyond the bounds of probability that many of the princesses who were offered to the royal Gupta family in accordance with the *kanyopāyanadāna* policy during the reign of Samudragupta were actually married to Chandragupta II.[5] Thus there are very good grounds to believe that romantic and amorous aspects of the personality of the legendary Vikramāditya owe their origin to the personality and character of Chandragupta II Vikramāditya.

There is yet another aspect of the Vikramāditya saga which may be connected with Chandragupta II. According to

1. *HIG*, p. 225.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 252 fn. 7 (Cont. on p. 253).
3. Samudragupta refers to a number of his grandsons in his Eran inscription (*SI*, pp. 269-70) while Kumāragupta I, the son of Chandragupta II begotten on Dhruvadevī, was obviously born after the murder of Rāmagupta which took place after the death of Samudragupta. Therefore, Kumāragupta I could hardly have been the eldest son of Chandragupta II.
4. *HIG.*, p. 253.
5. According to the *Kathāsaritsāgara* a number of princesses were offered to him by the rulers defeated by his father. Madanalekhā, the Sinhalese princess was one of them.

by their respective fathers to their ancestral throne.[1] Because of these common factors in their personalities and achievements, their individualities got fused together in popular imagination and the legendary personalities of an ideal king with all the virtues and attainments of these monarchs, gradually emerged. That explains the complex nature of the personality of Vikramāditya and that is how the Vikrama legend, the saga of the most popular Indian royal hero, originated.[2]

1. The facts that Samudragupta was nominated by Chandragupta I as his successor is recorded in the fourth verse of the Prayāga *praśasti* (*SI*, p. 263). The nomination of Chandragupta II by Samudragupta has been mentioned in the Bhitari record of Skandagupta (*ibid.*, p. 321) while the selection of the latter by his father Kumāragupta I is indicated by the *Kathāsaritasāgara* and the *Chandragarbhaparipṛichchhā*.
2. For an analysis of the evidence of the *Gāhā Sattasaī* of Hāla and *Bṛihatkathā* of Guṇāḍhya, the only two pre-Gupta works cited to prove the existence of the legendary Vikramāditya, vide, *supra*.

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

ORIGINAL SOURCES : TEXTS AND TRANSLATIONS

INDIAN SOURCES

Āchārāṅga : Ed. by Jacobi, H., PTS., London, 1882. Eng. trans. by Jacobi, H., SBE. Oxford, 1892.

Agni Purāṇa : Eng. trans. by Dutt, M.N. Calcutta, 1901.

Aitareya Brāhmaṇa : Trans. by Keith, A.B., HOS., Vol. XXV. Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A., 1920.

Amarakośa or Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana of Amarasiṁha : Ed. by Sastri, T., Ganapati, 4 parts, Trivandrum, 1914-17.

Aṅguttara Nikāya : Ed. Morris, R. and Hardy, E. PTS. London, 1885-1900.

Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya : Ed. by Shamasastri, R., Mysore, 1919. Eng. trans. by Shamasastri, R., Banglore, 1930. Text, Eng. trans. and a study by Kangle, R.P., 3 Vols., Bombay, 1960, 1963, 1965.

Ārya Mañjusri Mūla-Kalpa : Ed. Sastri T. Ganapati, 3 parts, TTS. Trivandrum, 1920-25.
Ed. and Eng. trans., Jayaswal, K.P., The Imperial History of India, Lahore, 1934.

Ashṭādhyāyī : Ed and trans. by Basu, S.C., 2 Vols., Allahabad, 1891-98.

Atharvaveda : Eng. trans. by Whitney, W.D., Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A., 1905.

Baudhāyana Dharmasūtra : Ed. by Chinnasvami Shastri, Banaras, 1934.

Jātaka : Ed. by Fausböll, V., 7 Vols. (Vol. 7 Index by Anderson, D.), London, 1877-97.
Eng. trans. under the Editorship of Cowell, E.B., 7 Vols., Cambridge, 1895-1913.

Jātakamālā of Arya Sūra : Ed. by Kern, H., Boston, 1891. Eng. trans. by Speyer, J., SBB. London, 1895.

Kādambarī of Bāṇa : Ed. by Kane. P.V., Bombay, 1920. Eng. trans. Ridding, C.M., London, 1896.

Kalpasūtra (Bṛihat-Kalpasūtra) of Bhadrabāhu : Ed. by Jacobi, H., Leipzig, 1879. Edg. trans. by Jacobi, H., Oxford, 1892.

Kālidāsa Granthāvalī : Being a collection of works of Kālidāsa. Ed. and Hindi trans. by Sītārāma Chaturvedi, Aligarh, 2019 V.S.

Kālakāchārya Kathānaka : Ed. by Jacobi, H., ZDMG, 1880. Eng. trans. Brown, W.N., Washington, 1933.

Kāmasūtra of Vātsyāyana : Ed: by Goswami, D.L., Banaras, 1928. Eng. trans. by Basu, B.N. revised by Ghose, R.L., 5th ed. Calcutta, 1944.
Ed. with Hindi trans. by Sastri, Devadutta, Varanasi, 1964.

Kāmandakīya Nītisāra : Ed. by Scholars of Sāṅga Veda Vidyalaya, Poona, 1858.
Ed. trans. Dutta, M.N., Calcutta, 1896.
Ed. by Mitra, R., BI, Calcutta, 1884.

Kathākośa : Translated by Tawney, C.H., London, 1895.

Kathāvatthu	: Ed. by Taylor, A.C., PTS. London, 1894. Eng. trans. by Aung, S.J. and Mrs. Rhys Davids, PTS. London, 1915,
Kathāsaritsāgara of Somadeva	: Eng. trans. by Tawney, C.H., 2 Vols., Calcutta, 1880-84.
Kaumudī-Mahotsava of Vijjaka (?)	: Ed. and trans. by Sakuntala Rao Sastri, Bombay, 1952.
Kaushītakī Brāhmaṇa	: Ed by Cowell, E.B., Calcutta, 1861.
Khyāt of Nainsī	: Pub. by Nāgarī Prachāriṇī Sabhā, Kāśī (Banaras). V.S. 1982. Pub. by Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute, Jodhpur, 3 Vols. Jodhpur, 1960-62.
Kitāb-ul Hind and Āthār-al-Bāquia of al-Berunī	: Eng. trans. (Alberuni's India) by Sachau. E.C., London, 1914. Indian Ed. Delhi, 1964.
Kitāb Futūh al Baldan of Ahmad ibn Yahya ibn-Jabir al-Balādhuri	: Eng. trans. by Hitli, P.K. and Murgotten, F.C. Cf. History of India as told by its own Historians, by Elliot, H.M. and Dowson, John. 8 Vols. London, 1867-77, Vol. I.
Kūrma Purāṇa	: Ed. by Mukhopadhyaya, N., BI, Culcutta, 1890.
Kuvalayamālā of Uddyotana Sūri	: Pub. Singhi Jain Series No. 45, Bombay 1959.
Lalitavistara	: Ed. by Mitra, Rajendralal, Calcutta, 1977.
Liṅga Purāṇa	: Ed. by Vidyasagar, J., BI, Calcutta, 1885.

Mahābhārata : (Bombay Ed.) Ed. by Kinjawadekar, R., Poona, 1929-33.
(Calcutta Ed.) Edited by Siromani, N. and others. BI, Calcutta, 1834-39.
(Kumbhakonam Ed.) Edited by Krishnacharya, T.R. and V. Vyasacharya, T.R., Bombay, 1905-10.
(Critical Ed.) Edited by Sukthankar, V.S., Edgerton, F. Raghu Vira, De, S.K., Belvalkar, S.K., Vaidya, P.L. etc. Poona, 1927-1966 (in Progress.)
Eng. trans. by M.N. Dutta, Calcutta, 1895-1905
Gita Press Gorakhpur ed., V.S. 2012-2026.

Mahāvaṁsa : Edited by Geiger, W., PTS., London, 1908.
Eng. trans. (The Great Chronicle of Ceylon) by Geiger, W. etc., London, 1912.

Mahāvastu : Edited by Senart, E., 3 Vols. Paris, 1882-97.

Mahābhāshya of Patañjali : Ed. by Kielhorn, F., 3 Vols., Bombay, 1892-1909.
Ed. and trans. Chatterji, K.C., Calcutta, 1957.

Mahābodhivaṁsa of Upatissa : Edited by Strong, S.A. PTS. London, 1891.

Milindapañho : Edited by Trenckner, V., London 1880.
Eng. trans. by Rhys Davids, T.W., SBE. Oxford, 1890-94.

Majjhima Nikāya : Edited by Trenckner, V. and Chalmers, R., PTS. London, 1888-1902.
Eng. trans. (Further Dialogues of the Buddha) by Lord Chalmers, 2 Vols. SBE. London, 1926-27.

Mālavikāgnimitra of Kālidāsa : Edited by Pandit, S.P., BBS. 2nd Ed. Bombay, 1889.
Eng. trans. by Tawney, C.H., London, 1891.
Ed. with Hindi trans. by Sitaram Chaturvedi, Aligarh, V.S. 2019.

Manu Dharma-Śāstra (Mānava Dharma-Śāstra or Manu-Smṛiti) : Edited by Jolly. J., London, 1887.
Eng. trans. by Buhler, G., 'The Laws of Manu', SBE., Vol. XXV, Oxford, 1886.
Eng. trans. (with notes) by Ganganatha Jha, 5 Vols. Calcutta, 1922-29.

Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa : Edited by Banerjee, K.M., BI., Eng. trans. by Pargiter, F.E., Calcutta, 1904.

Matsya Purāṇa : Ed. ASS, Poona, 1907.
Eng. trans. Basu. B.D., Allahabad, 1916.

Mudrārākshasa of Viśākhadatta : Ed. with Eng. trans. by Dhruva, K.H., 2nd Ed. Poona, 1923.

Nārada Smṛiti : Edited by Jolly, J., Calcutta, 1885.
Eng. trans. Jolly, J. SBE. Vol. XXXIII, Oxford, 1889 (Longer Version).

Navasāhasāṅkacharita of Padmagupta alias Parimala : Edited by Islampurkar, V.S., BSS., Bombay, 1895.

Nītivākyāmṛita of Somadeva Sūri : Edited by Soni, P.L., 2 Vols., SBH., Bombay, 1923, 1933.

Padma Purāṇa : Edited by Mandlik, V.N., ASS., 4 Vols. Poona, 1893-94.

Pañchatantra : Edited by Edgerton, F., Poona, 1930.

Pañchaviṁśa Brāhmaṇa : Eng. trans. by Caland, W., Calcutta, 1931.

Parisishṭaparvan or Sthavirāvalī-charita : Being an appendix of the Trishashṭi-śalākāpurusha-charita of Hemachandra. Ed. by Jacobi, H., BI., Calcutta, 1883-91; 2nd Ed., 1932.

Petavatthu : Edited by Minayeff, J., PTS., London, 1 88.

Prabandha-Chintāmaṇi : Eng. trans. Tawney. C.H., Calcutta, 1899.

Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age : Bv Pargiter, F.E., Oxford, 1913. 2nd ed. Varanasi, 1962.

Raghuvaṁśa of Kālidāsa : Edited by Pandit, S.P., 3Vols. BSS. Bombay, 1869-74.
Ed. with Eng. trans. by Nandargikar, G.R., 3rd Ed. Bombay, 1897.
Kālidāsa Granthāvalī, Ed. by Sitarama Chaturvedi, Aligarh, V.S. 2019.

Rājataraṅgiṇī of Kalhaṇa : Edited by Durga Prasad, Bombay, 1892.
Eng. trans. by Stein, M.A., Westminister, 1900.
Ed. with Hindi trans. by Tejrama Sastri, Varanasi, 1960.

Rājāvali Kathā : Cf. Fleet, J.F., Indian Antiquary, 1892, pp. 157 ff.

Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki : Ed. Varamasarma Vashishtha, Banaras, 1957.

Ed. with Eng. trans. Dutt, M.N., Calcutta, 1891-93.
Trans. with Eng. verse by Griffith, R.T.H., Banaras, 1915.
Critical Ed. by Raghu Vira, Lahore, 1938.
Gita Press, Gorakhpur Ed., 1969.

Ṛigveda : Saṁhitā and Pada text with Sāyaṇa's commentary critically edited by Vaidika Saṁśodhana Maṇḍala, Poona, 4 Vols., 1933-51.
Eng. trans. by Griffith, R.T.H., 2 Vols., 2nd Ed. Banaras, 1896-97.
Eng. trans. of the first six Maṇḍalas by Wilson, H.H., London, 1950-57.
Eng. trans. by Geldner, Cambridge, Massachusetts, U.S.A., 1951.

Sāmaveda : Ed. with trans. by Th. Benfey. Leipzig, 1848.
Ed. by Satyavrata Samasrami, Calcutta, 1872.

Saṁyutta Nikāya : Ed. by Leon Freer, PTS., London, 1884-94.
Indexes by Mrs. Rhys Davids, London 1904.
Eng. trans. (Book of the Kindred Sayings or Grouped Suttas) by Mrs. Rhys Davids and Woodward, F.L., PTS., I ondon, 1917-30.

Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa : Edited by Weber, A., London, 1885.
Eng. trans. by Eggeling, J., SBE, Vols. XII, XXVI, XLI, XLI, XLIII, XLIV. Oxford, 1882-1900.

Śiśupālavadha of Māgha : Ed. NSP. 9th Ed. Bombay, 1927.
Ed. with Hindi trans. by Tripathi, R.P. (Sastri), Prayaga (Allahabad), V.S. 2009.

Sumangala Vilāsini : Commentary on the Dīgha Nikāya. Edited by Rhys Davids, T.W. and Others, 3 Vols., PTS., London. 1886-1932.

Sutta Nipāta : Ed. by Anderson, D. and Smith, H., PTS., London, 1913.
Eng. trans. by Fausböll, V., SBE., Oxford, 1898.

Taittirīya Brāhmana : Edited by Mitra, R., 3 Vols. Calcutta, 1855-70.

Thera-gāthā : Edited by Pischel R., PTS., London, 1883.
Eng. trans. by Mrs. Rhys Davids, PTS., London, 1909.

Therī-gāthā : Ed. by Oldenberg. H., PTS., London, 1883.
Eng. trans. by Mrs. Rhys Davids, PTS., London, 1913.

The Upanishads : Ed. and trans. Müller, F. Max, SBE., Vols. I and XV, Oxford, 1879, 1884.

Upanishads, The Principal : Ed. Radhakrishanan, S., London, 1953.

Upanishads with Hindi Trans. and Bhāshya : 4 Vols. Gita Press Ed. Gorakhpur, V.S. 1992-20.

Uttarādhyayana Sūtra : Ed. by Charpentier, J., Uppasal, 1922.
Eng. trans. by Jacobi, H., SBE., Oxford, 1895.

Vāyu Purāṇa : Edited by Mitra, R., 2 Vols., BI., Calcutta, 1880-88.

Viddhaśālabhañjikā of Rājasekhara : Ed. by Atre, B.R., Poona, 1886. Ed. with commentary by Chaudhuri, J.B., Calcutta, 1943.
Eng. trans. by Gray, L.H., JAOS, XXVII, pp. 1-71.

Vinaya Piṭaka : Ed. by Oldenberg, H., PTS., London, 1879-83.
Eng. trans. (Vinaya Texts) by Rhys Davids, T.W. and Oldeberg, H., SBE., Vols. XIII, XVII, XX, Oxford, 1881, 1882, 1885.

Vishṇu Purāṇa : Gita Press, Gorakhpur Edition. Eng. trans. by Wilson, H.H., 5 Vols., London, 1864-70; Calcutta, 1961.

Vishṇudharmottara Purāṇa : Pub. Venkatesvara Press, Bombay, 1912.

Yājñavalkya-Smṛiti : Eng. trans. by Charpure, Bombay, 1936-44.

Yajurveda : Taittirīya Saṁhitā (Black Y.V.). Eng. trans. by Keith, A.B., 2 Vols., HOS., Vols. XVIII-XIX, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A., 1914. Ed. Ananta Shastri Dhupkar, Aundh, 1945.
Vājasaneyī Saṁhitā (White Y.V.). Eng. trans. by Griffith, R.T.H., Banaras, 1927.

FOREIGN SOURCES

(For a select bibliography of primary and secondary sources in Chinese except Fa-Hien, Yuan Chwang and I-tsing vide, Papers on the Date of Kanishka, Edited by A.L. Basham, Leiden, 1968, and Harsha : A Political Study, by D. Devahuti, Oxford, 1970).

CHINESE

Fa-Hien : The Shaman Fa-Hien's account of his travels in India. Trans. by Legge, J., A Record of Buddhistic Kingdoms, etc., Oxford, 1886. Eng. trans. by Giles, H.A., The Travels of Fa-Hsien (A.D. 399-414) or Record of Buddhistic Kingdoms, Cambridge, 1923. 2nd impression, London, 1956.

I-tsing : A record of Buddhist Practices Sent Home from the Southern Sea.
Trans. by Takakusu, J., A Record of the Buddhist Religion as Practised in India and the Malay Archipelago (A. D. 571-695), Oxford, 1896.

Shaman Hui-Li : Life of the Master of the Law, Tripitaka, of the Great Monastery of Motherly Love. Eng. trans. by Beal, S., The Life of Hiuen-Tsiang, London, 1911. Reprint Delhi, 1973.

Yuan Chwang : Si-yu-ki. Trans. by Beal, S., Buddhist Records of the Western World, 2 Vols. London, 1884, 1906. Reprint Delhi, 1961.
Trans. by Watters, T., On Yuan Chwangs Travel's in India, 2 Vols., Ed. after his death by Rhys Davids, T.W. and Bushell, S.W., London, 1904-5. Reprint, Delhi. 1961.

TIBETAN

Taranatha, Lama : Eng, trans. Mystic tales of Lama Taranatha by Datta, B.N.. Calcutta, 1944.
Eng. trans. (History of Buddhism in India) by Ghoshal, U.N. and Dutt, N., IAQ, III, IV, VI, VII, VIII, X, XXVII, XXVIII.

GREEK AND LATIN

Mc Crindle, J.W. (ed.) : Ancient India an described by Megasthenes (Fragments of the Indika of) and Arrian (first part of the Indika of), Calcutta, 1877. Reprint, Calcutta, 1926.
Ancient India as described by Ptolemy, being a translation of (the relevant

parts of the) Geography, Calcutta, etc., 1885. Ed. by Majumdar, S.N., Calcutta, 1927.

: Ancient India as Described in Classical Literature, *Westminister, 1901.*

: The Invasion of India by Alexander the Great as Described by *Arrian, Q.* Curtius, Diodorus, Plutarch and Justin Westminister, 1896.

The Commerce and *Navigation* of the Erythraean Sea, being a translation of the Periplus Maris Erythraei, Calcutta, etc., 1879. Eng. trans. (The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea.) by Schoff, W.H., London, 1912.

Majumdar, R.C. (ed.) : The Classical Accounts of India, Calcutta, 1960.[1]

ORIGINAL SOURCES : INSCRIPTIONS AND COINS

INSCRIPTIONS

Barua, B.M. : Aśoka and his Inscriptions, Culcutta, 1940.

Bhandarkar, D.R. : A List of Inscriptions of Northern India in Brāhmī and its Derivative Scripts, from about 200 A.C. Appendix to the Epigraphia Indica. Vols. XIX (1927-28)-XXIII (1935-36).

Fleet, J.F. : Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, Vol. III (Inscriptions of the Early Gupta Kings and their Successors), Calcutta, 1888, Reprint, Varanasi, 1963.

Luders, H. : A list of Brāhmī Inscriptions from the Earliest Times to about A.D. 400 with the exception of those of Aśoka. Appendix to the Epigraphia Indica, Vol. X (1909-1910).

Mirashi, V.V. : Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, Vol. IV, 2 parts, Oatacamund, 1955.

— — — Vākāṭaka Rājavaṁśa kā Itihāsa tathā Abhilekha (in Hindi), Varanasi, 1964.

Pandey, R.B. : Aśoka ke Abhilekha (in Hindi), Varanasi, V.S. 2022.

— — — : Historical and Literary Inscriptions, Varanasi, 1962.

Sircar, D.C. : Select Inscriptions bearing on Indian History and Civilization, Vol. I (From the sixth century B.C. to the sixth century A.D.), Calcutta, 1942, 2nd Revised Ed., Calcutta, 1965.

Vidyavijaya (Ed.) : Prāchīna Lekha Saṁgraha, Bhavanagar, 1929.

COINS

Allan, J. : Catalogue of the Coins of Ancient India (in the British Museum), London, 1933.

— — — : Catalogue of the Coins of the Gupta Dynasties and Śaśāṅka, King of Gauḍa (in the British Museum), London, 1914.

Altekar, A.S. : Catalogue of the Gupta Gold Coins in the Bayana Hoard, Bombay, 1954. The Coinage of the Gupta Empire, Banaras, 1957.

Brown, C.J. : Catalogue of the Coins of the Guptas, Maukharis, etc. in the Provincial Museum, Lucknow, Allahabad, 1920.

— — — : Coins of India, Calcutta, 1922.

Cunningham, A. : Coins of Ancient India from the Earliest Times down to the Seventh Century A.D., London, 1891.

— — — : Coins of Indo-Sythians. Reprinted from the Numismatic Chronocle, London, 1888-92.

— — — : Coins of Medieval India from the Seventh Century down to the Muhammadan Conquest, London, 1894.

— — — : Later Indo-Sythians, Reprinted from the Numismatic Chronocle, London, 1893-95. Cf. Complete work of A. Cunningham, Ed. by Narain, A.K. Varanasi, 1962.

Rapson. E.J. : Catalogue of the Coins of the Āndhra dynasty, the Western Kshatrapas, the Traikuṭaka Dynasty and the Bodhi dynasty. (*Catalogue of Indian Coins* in the British Museum, Vol. IV) London, 1908.

— — — : Indian Coins, Strassburg, 1897.

Reu, B.N. : Coins of Marwar, Jodhpur, 1946.

Singhal, C.R. : Bibliography of Indian Coins, Bombay, 1950.

Smith, V.A. : Catalogue of the Coins in the Indian Museum, Calcutta, including the Cabinet of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol. I, Oxford, 1906.

Webb, W.W. : *The Currencies of the Hindu States* of Rajputana, Westminister, 1893. Reprint, Delhi, 1972.

Whitehead, R.B. : Catalogue of Coins in the Punjab Museum, Lahore, Vol. I : Indo-Greek Coins. Oxford. 1914.

Modern General Works

Agrawal. V.S. : Harshacharita-Ex Sānskritika Adhyayana (in Hindi), Patna, 1953.

: India as known to Pāṇinī—a study of the Cultural Material in the Ashṭādhyāyı, Lucknow, 1953.

: Pāṇinikālına Bhāratavarsha, Varanasi, V.S. 2012.

Aiyangar, S.K. : Ancient India and South Indian History and Culture. 2 Vols. Poona, 1941.

Allchin, Bridget and Raymond : The Birth of Indian Civilization (India and Pakistan before 500 B.C.) Penguin Books, 1968.

Altekar, A.S. : State and Government in Ancient India, Banaras, 1955.

Apte, V.S. : The Students' Sanskrit-English Dictionary, Delhi, 1970.

: The Students' English-Sanskrit Dictionary, Delhi, 1963.

Archaeology in India : Bureau of Education, India, Pub. No. 66. Delhi, 1950.

Arvamuthan, T.G. : The Kāverī, the Maukharis and the Sangam Age, Madras, 1925.

Asopa, R.K. : Mārawāra kā Mūla Itihāsa, Jodhpur, 1931.

Awasthi, A.B.L. : Rajput Polity, Lucknow, 1968.

Bagchi, P.C. : India and Central Asia, Calcutta, 1955.

——— : India and China, Bombay, 1950.

——— : The Aryan in North-Eastern India, Calcutta, 1934.

Bandyopadhyaya, N.C. : Economic Life and Progress in Ancient India, Part I, 2nd Ed. Calcutta, 1945.

Banerji, A. : Archaeological History of South-Eastern Rajasthan, Varanasi, 1971.

Banerji, A.C. : Rajput Studies, Calcutta, 1944.

Banerji, G.N. : Hellenism in Ancient India, Calcutta, 1920.

Banerjee, N.R. : The Iron Age in India, Delhi, 1965.

Banerji, R.D. : The Age of Imperial Guptas, Banaras, 1933.

Bapat, P.V. (ed.) : 2,500 years of Buddhism, Delhi, 1956.

Barnett, L.D. : Antiquities of India, London, 1913.

Barua, B. M. : Aśoka and His Inscriptions, Calcutta, 1946.

Basak, R.G. : History of North-Eastern India (c. A.D. 320-760) Calcutta, 1934.

Basham, A.L. : The Wonder that was India, London, 1954. Reprint, Delhi, 1971,

——— : Studies in Indian History and Culture, Calcutta, 1964.

———(ed.) : Papers on the Date of Kanishka, Leiden, 1968.

B.C. Law Volume : 2 Parts, Calcutta, 1945.

Bhandarkar, D.R. : Lectures on the Ancient History of India (Carmichael Lectures, 1918). Calcutta, 1919.

——— : Aśoka (Charmichael Lectures, 1923), Calcutta, 1932. Reprint, 1955.

——— : Ancient Indian Numismatics, Calcutta, 1921.

——— : Some Aspects of Ancient Hindu Polity, (Nandi Lectures, 1925). Varanasi, 1929.

——— : Commemoration Volume, ed. B.C. Law, Calcutta, 1940.

Bhandarkar, R.G. : Early History of the Dekkan, 3rd. ed. Calcutta, 1928.

: A Peep into the Early History of India, Bombay, 1920.

——— : Commemoration Volume, Poona, 1917.

Bhatia, P. : The Paramaras, New Delhi, 1970.

Brown, W.N. : The Story of Kālaka, Texts, History, Legends, etc., Washington, 1933.

Buhler, J.G. : Indian Palaeography, ed. Fleet, J.F., I.A., Vol. XXXIII, Bombay, 1904.

Chanda, R.P. : The Indo-Aryan Races, Rajshahi, 1916.

Chatterji, G.S. : Harshavardhana (in Hindi), 2nd ed. Allahabad, 1950.

Chatterji, K.C. : Pātañjali Mahābhāshya, Cacutta, 1950.

Chattopadhyaya, B. : The Age of Kushāṇas—A Numismatic Study, Calcutta, 1967.

Chattopadhyaya, K.C.: Date of Kālidāsa, Allahabad, 1926.

Chattopadhyaya, S. : Early History of North India, Calcutta 1958.

—— : The Achaemenids and India, 2nd. Revised Ed., Delhi, 1974.

—— : The Śakas in India, Shantiniketan, 1967.

Chaudhary, G.C. : Political History of Northern India From Jain Sources (c. 650 A.D. to 1300 A.D.) Amritsar, 1963.

Chaudhuri, P.C. : The History of the Civilization of the People of Assam to the Twelfth Century A.D., Gauhati, 1959.

Childe, V. Gordon. : Man Makes Himself, London, 1948.

Cunningham, A. Books of Indian Eras, London, 1889.

—— : The Ancient Geography of India, ed. S.N. Majumdar Shastri, Calcutta, 1924. Reprint, Varanasi, 1963.

Dandekar, R.N. : A History of the Guptas, Poona, 1941.

Dandekar, R.N., and Pusalker, A.D. : Oriental Studies in India, New Delhi, 1964.

Dange, S.A. : India from Pre-historic Communism to Slavery, Bombay, 1949.

Dani, A.H. : Indian Palaeography, Oxford, 1963.

Dasgupta, K.K. : The Mālavas, Calcutta, 1966.

De, S.C. : Kālidāsa and Vikramāditya, Calcutta, 1928.

Dey, N.L. : The Geographical Dictionary of Ancient and Medieval India, London, 1927.

Devahuti, D. : Harsha : A Political Study, Oxford, 1970.

Dikshitar, V.R.R. : The Purāṇa Index. 2 Vols., Madras, 1951, 1952.

——— : Hindu Administrative Institutions, Madras, 1929.

——— : The Mauryan Polity, Madras, 1932.

——— : 1952.

Drekmeier, C. : in Early 1962.

Dutt, Sukumar : Buddhist Monks and Monasteries in *India, London, 1962.*

East, N.G. : Geography Behind History, London, 1958.

Elliot, Sir H.M. and Dowson, John (ed.) : *History of India : as Told by Its own* Historians (the Muhammadan Period), 8 Vols., London, 1867-77. Reprinted from Aligarh and Allahabad.

Ettinghausen, M.L. : Harshavardhana : Emperor et Poet, etc., London, 1906.

Fick, R. : The Social Organization in North-East India in Buddhas' time, Calcutta, 1920.

Ganguli, D.C. —— : History of Paramara Dynasty, Dacca, 1933.

Gehlot, J.S. : Rājpūtāne kā Itihāsa (History of various Princely States in different Parts in Hindi), *Jodhpur, 1960.*

Ghirshaman, R. : *Iran, Penguin Books, 1951.*

Ghosh, A. (ed.) : *Archaeological Remains, Monuments* and Museums, Archaeological Survey of India, 2 Vols., New Delhi, 1964.

Ghoshal, U.N. : A History of Indian Political Ideas, Bombay, 1959.

— — — : Studies in Indian History and Culture, Calcutta, 1957.

Gokhale, B.G. : Samudragupta and His Times, Bombay, 1962.

Gopal, Lallanji. : The Economic Life of Northern India, A.D, 700-1200, Delhi, 1965.

Gopalachari, K. : Early History of the Andhra Country, Madras, 1941.

Gupta, P.L, : Gupta Sāmrājya (in Hindi) Varanasi, 1970.

Gupta, Parmanand. : Geography in Ancient Indian Inscriptions, Delhi, 1973.

Goyal, S.R. : A History of the Imperial Guptas, Allahabad, 1966.

— — — : Prāchīna Bhārata kā Rājanītika Itihās, pt. III (in Hindi), Allahabad, 1969.

— — — : Abhilekha Saṁhitā, M.S. (in Hindi). To be shortly published.

Grierson, G.A. : The Linguistic Survey of India, Vol. IX, pt. II, Calcutta, 1908.

Haig, Sir Wolseley (ed.) : The Cambridge History of India, Vol. III, Delhi, 1958.

Havell, E.B. : History of Aryan Rule in India from the Earliest Times to the Death of Akbar, London, 1918.

Helestermann, J.C. : The Ancient Indian Royal Consecration, The Hague, 1957.

Jain, J.C. : Life in Ancient India as Dipicted in the Jain Canon, Bombay, 1947.

Jain, J.P. : The Jain Sources of the History of Ancient India (100 B.C.-A.D. 900) Delhi, 1964.

Jain, K.C. : Ancient Cities and Towns of Rajasthan, Delhi, 1977.

— — — : Jainism in Rajasthan, Sholapur, 1963.

— — — : Malwa Through the Ages, Delhi, 1972.

Jayaswal, K.P. : History of India, 150 A.D. to 350 A.D. Lahore, 1933.

: Imperial History of India, Lahore, 1934.

— — — : Hindu Polity, 3rd ed., Banglore, 1955.

Jayaswal, P.K. : Śaka Kālīna Bhārata (in Hindi), Allahabad, 1963.

Jha, D.N. : Revenue System in Post-Maurya and Gupta Times, Calcutta, 1967,

Jouveau-Dubreul, G. : Ancient History of the Deccan (trans. from the French by Dikshitar, V.S.S.), Pondichery, 1920.

Kane, P.V. : *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vols. I-V, Poona, 1930-62.

Keith, A.B. : A History of Sanskrit Literature, Oxford, 1928. *Reprint*, 1953.

Keith, A.B. and Macdonell, A.A. : Vedic Index of Names and Subjects, 2 *Vols., London, 1912*. Reprint, Varanasi, 1958.

Kosambi, D.D. : An Introducation to the Study of Indian History, Bombay 1956.

— — — : The Culture and Civilizasion of Ancient *India in Historical Outline*, London, 1965.

Kumar, Baldev : The Early Kushāṇas, New Delhi, 1973.

Lal, B.B. : Indian Archaeology Since Independence, Delhi, 1964.

Law, B.C. : Geography of Early Buddhism, London,

— — — : Ancient Indian Tribes, Lahore, 1926.

— — — . India as Described in the Early Texts *of* Buddhism and Jainism, London, 1941.

— — — : Tribes in Ancient India, Poona, 1943.

— — — : Some Kshatriya Tribes of Ancient India, Calcutta, 1924.

— — — : *Ancient Mid-Indian Kshatriya Tribes*, Vol. I, Calcutta, 1924.

— — — : History of Pali Literature, 2 Vols., London, 1933.

— — — : Commemoration Volume, ed. Bhandarkar, D.R., Sastri, K.A.N. *and Others*, 2 Vols., Calcutta and Poona, 1945-46.

Law, M.M. : Aspects of Ancient Hindu Polity, Oxford, 1921.

— — — : Inter-state Relations in Ancient India, London, 1920.

Levi, S. : Pre-Aryan and Pre-Dravidian in India (Eng. trans. by P.C. Bagachi), Calcutta, 1929.

Lee un, Van Lohuizen De, J.E. : The Scythian Period, Leiden, 1949.

Macdonell, A.A. : A History of Sanskrit Literature, London, 1900.

Maity, S.K. : Economic Life of Northern India in the Gupta Period, A.D. 300-500, Calcutta, 1958.

Majumdar, A.K. : Chaulukyas of Gujarat, Bombay, 1956.

Majumdar, D.N. : Races and Cultures of India, 4th ed. London, 1961.

Majumdar, M.R. (ed.): Historical and Cultural Chronology of Gujarat, Baroda, 1960.

Majumdar, R.C. : Ancient India, 6th ed., Delhi, 1971.

— — — : Corporate Life in Ancient India, 2nd ed., Calcutta, 1922.

— — — : Ancient History of Bangal, Calcutta, 1971.

— — (ed.) : History of Bengal, Vol. I, Dacca, 1943.

Majumdar, R.C. and Altekar, A.S. (ed.) : A New History of the Indian People, Vol. VI (The Vākāṭaka Gupta Age) Lahore, 1946; Reprint, Banaras, 1954.

Majumdar, R.C. (gen. ed.) and Pusalker, A.D., Majumdar, A.K. : The History and Culture of the Indian People. 11 Volume Project, Bhāratīya Vidyā Bhavan, Bombay, 1951—in Progress.

— — — : Vol. I, Vedic Age, 4th impression, Bombay, 1965.

— — — : Vol. II, The Age of Imperial Unity, 3rd impression, Bombay, 1960.

— — — : Vol. III, The Classical Age, 2nd impression, Bombay, 1962.

— — — : Vol. IV, The Age of Imperial Kanauj, 2nd ed. Bombay, 1964.

Malalasekera, G.P. : Dictionary of Pali Proper Names, 2 Vols., London, 1937. Reprint, 1960.

Marshal, Sir John : Mohenjo-daro and the Indus Civilization, 3 Vols., London, 1931.

Mehta, R.L. : Pre-Buddhist India, Bombay, 1939.

Mirashi, V.V. : Studies in Indology, 3 Vols., Poona, 1960.

Mishra, V.B. : The Gurjara Pratiharas and their Times, Delhi, 1966.

Misra, V.N. : Palaeolithic Culture of Western Rajputana, Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute, 21, Poona, 1961.

Mishra, G.S.P. : The Age of Vinaya, Delhi, 1972.

Mookerji, R.K. : Aśoka (Gaekwad Lectures), London, 1928.

— — — : Chandragupta Maurya and His Times, Madras, 1943. 2nd ed., Delhi, 1952.

— — — : Harsha, London, 1926.

— — — : The Gupta Empire, Bombay, 1948.

— — — : Local Self Government in Ancient India, Oxford, 1919. Reprint of 2nd ed., Delhi, 1958.

— — — : Hindu Civilization, London, 1936.

Mookerji, R.K. (ed.) : Vikrama Volume, Ujjain, 1948.

Motichandra. : Sārthavāha (in Hindi), Patna, 1953.

Moraes, G.M. : Kadamba-kula, Bombay, 1931.

Mukherjee, B.N. : The Kushāṇas and the Deccan, pt. I, Calcutta, 1968.

Munshi, K.M. : The Glory that was Gurjara-deśa (A.D. 500-1300), Bombay, 1954.

Narain, A.K. : The Indo-Greeks, Oxford, 1962.

Negi, J.S. : Groundwork of Ancient India History, Allahabad, 1958.

Niyogi, Roma. : The History of the Gahaḍavāla Dynasty, Calcutta, 1959.

Ojha, G.H. : The History of Rajputana, 5 Vols, (with parts, statewise) (in Hindi), Ajmer, 1927-40.

——— : Bhāratīya Prāchīna Lipimālā, Ajmer, 1918.

Ojha, K.C. : The History of Foreign Rule in Ancient India, Allahabad, 1968.

Pande, G.C. : Studies in the Origins of Buddhism, Allahabad, 1957.

——— : Buddha Dharma ke Vikāsa kā Itihāsa, Lucknow, 1962.

Pandey, A.B. : Early Medieval India, Allahabad, 1960.

Pandey, M.S. : Historical Geography and Topography of Bihar, Delhi, 1963.

Pandey, R.B. : Vikramāditya-Saṁvata Pravartaka, Banaras, 1960.

——— : Vikramāditya of Ujjayani, Banaras, 1951.

——— : Hindu Saṁskāras, Banaras, 1949.

Pandye, V.P. : Harivaṁśa Purāṇa : ek Sānskritika Adhyayana, Lucknow, 1960.

Panikkar, K.M. : Geographical Factor in Indian History Bombay, 1955.

——— : Sri Harsha of Kanauj, Bombay, 1922.

Pargiter, E.F. : Burāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age, London, 1913, 2nd ed. Varanasi, 1962.

——— : Ancient Indian Historical Tradition, Delhi, 1962.

Pathak, V.N. : Uttar Bhārata kā Rājanītika Itihāsa, A.D. 600-1290 (in Hindi), Lucknow, 1973.

Pathak, V.S. : Ancient Historians of India, Bombay, 1966.

Penzer, N.M. : Ocean of Stories, Vol. I-X, London, 1924-28.

Philips, C.H. (ed.) : Historians of India, Pakistan and Ceylon, Newyork, 1961.

Piggot, Stuart. : Pre-historic India, Penguin Books, 1950.

Pires, E.A. : The Maukharis, Madras, 1934.

Prakash, Buddha. : Aspects of Indian History and Civilization, Agra, 1965.

——— : Political and Social Movements in Ancient Punjab, Delhi, 1964.

——— : Studies in History and Civilization, Agra, 1965.

Prasad, Ishwari. : History of Medieval India, Allahabad, 1960.

Puri, B.N. : India Under the Kushāṇas, Bombay, 1965.

——— : India as Described by Early Greek Writers, Allahabad, 1939.

——— . The History of the Gurjara Pratiharas, Bombay, 1957.

——— : Study of Indian History, Bombay, 1971.

Puri, K.N. : Excavations at Rairh (During V.S. 1995-96), Jaipur, 1941.

Qanungo, K.R. : Studies in Rajput History, Delhi, 1959.

Rao, V.B. : Uttar Vaidika Samāja evam Sanskṛiti, Varanasi, 1966.

Rapson, E.J. : Ancient India, Cambridge, 1922. Reprint, Delhi, 1962.

Rawlinson, H.G. : Intercourse between India and the Western World, Cambridge, 1916.

Ray, H.C. : The Dynastic History of Northern India, 2 Vols., Calcutta, 1931, 1936.

Raychaudhuri, G.C. : History of Mewar, Calcutta.

Raychaudhuri, H.C. : Political History of Ancient India, 4th ed., Calcutta, 1938, 6th ed,, 1953.

Reu, B.N. : Mārwāra kā Itihāsa, 2 pts., Jodhpu 1938, 1940.

Rhys Davids, T.W. : Buddhist India, London, 1903. Reprint, Calcutta 1959.

Risley, H.H. : The People of India, ed. W. Crooke London, 1915.

Roy, U.N. : Studies in Ancient Indian History anc Culture, Allahabad, 1969.

Rockhill, W.W. : The Life of the Buddha, London 1907.

Sahani, D.R. : Archaeological Remains and Excava tions at Sambhar (During V.S. 1993 94), Jaipur, 1940.

Saletore, R.N. : Life in the Gupta Age, Bombay, 1943.

Sankalia, H.D. : Indian Archaeology Today, Bombay 1962.

——— : Pre-history and Proto-history in India and Pakistan, Bombay, 1963.

Sastri, K.A. Nilakanta : Factors in Indian History, Waltair, 1949.

——— : History of India, Vol. I, Madras, 1950

———(ed.) : A Comprehensive History of India, Vol. II, the Mauryas and Sātavāhanas, 325 B.C.-A.D. 300, Madras, etc., 1957.

———(ed.) : Age of the Nandas and Mauryas, Banaras, 1952.

——— and Ramana, H.S. : Historical Method, Madras, 1956.

Sharma, B.N. : Harsha and His Times, Varanasi, 1970.

Sharma, Dasharatha. : Early Chauhan Dynasties, Delhi, 1959.

——— : Lectures on Rajput History and Culture, Delhi, 1970.

——— (ed.) : Rajasthan Through the Ages, Vol. I, Bikaner, 1966.

Sharma, G.R. : The excavations of Kauśāmbī, Allahabad, 1960.

——— (ed.) : Kushāṇa Studies, Allahabad, 1968.

Sharma, G.N. : Social Life in Medieval Rajasthan, Agra, 1968.

: Rājasthan ke Itihāsa ke Srota, pt. I, (in Hindi), Jaipur, 1973.

: Rājasthān kā Itihāsa, pt. I. (in Hindi), Agra, 1973.

Sharma, M.L. : Kota Rājya kā Itihāsa, pt. I. (in Hindi) Kota, V.S. 1996.

Sharma, R.S. : Aspects of Political Ideas and Institutions in Ancient India, Delhi, 1959, 2nd ed., 1968.

: Indian Feudalism : c. *300-1200 A.D.*, Calcutta, 1965.

——— : Śūdras in Ancient India, Delhi, 1958.

Sharan, M.K. : Tribal Coins—A Study, Delhi, 1972.

Shastri, A.M. : India as Seen in the Bṛihat saṁhitā of Varāhamihra, Delhi 1967.

Shyamaldas, Kaviraj : Vira Vinoda, 4 Vols. Udaipur, V.S. 1943.

Sinha, B.P : The Decline of the Kingdom of Magadha (Cir. A.D. 455-1000), Patna, 1954.

Sinha, H.N. : Sovereignty in Ancient Indian Polity, London, 1938.

Singh, M.M. : Life in North-Eastern India in Pre-Mauryan Time, Delhi 1967.

Singh, M.R. : A Critical Study of the Geographical Data in the Early Purāṇas, Calcutta, 1972.

Sircar, D.C. : Ancient Malwa and the Vikramāditya Tradition, Delhi, 1965.

— — — : Indian Epigraphy, Delhi, 1275.

— — — : Inscription of Aśoka, Delhi, 1967.

— — — : Land System and Feudalism in Ancient India, Calcutta, 1966.

— — — : Studies in the Society and ...tion of Ancient and Medi... Calcutta, 1966.
— — — : Studies in Indian Coins, Del...
— — — : Studies in the Geography ... and Medieval India, Delhi.
— — — : The Guhilas of Kishkindhā
— — — : The Successors of the Sāta... the Lower Deccan, Calcutta
Sitaram, Lala. : History of Sirohi Raj, A... 1920.
Smith, V.A. : The Early History of India, ... B.C. to the Muhammadan ... including the Invasion of ... 4th ed., Oxford, 1923, Repin...
— — — : Aśoka, the Buddhist empero... 3rd ed., Oxford, 1924.
Sorensen, S.N. : Index to the Names in the M...rata, London, 1904.
Spellman, J.W. : Political Theory of Ancient I... ford. 1964.
Sukthankar, V.S. : The Meaning of Mahābhārat... 1957.
— — — : Critical Study in the Ma... Poona, 1944.
Tarn, W.W. : The Greeks in Bactria and Ind... bridge, 1934.
Tessitori, L.P. : Bardic and Historical Surv... Rajputana (Published in the ... of the Asiatic Society of Ben... X. 1914).
Thapur, R. : Aśoka and the Decline of the M... Oxford. 1961.
Thakur, Upendra. : The Hūṇas in India, Varanas...
Tod, James. : Annals and Antiquities of Ra... ed. W. Crooke. Oxford, 1914. 3 Vols., Delhi, 1971.

Tripathi, R.S. : History of Kanauj—To the Moslem Conquest, Banaras, 1927, Delhi, 1959.

Upadhyaya, B.S. : Buddha Kālīna Bhāratīya Bhūgola (in Hindi), Allahabad, 1939.

Vaidya, C.V. : History of Medieval Hindu India, 3 Vols, Poona, 1921, 1924, 1926.

Vidyalankar, S. : Maurya Sāmrājya kā Itihāsa (in Hindi), Mussoorie, 1971.

Virji, Krishnakumari, J. : Ancient History of Saurashtra, Bombay 1955.

Wheeler, M. : Early India and Pakistan, Thames and Hudson, 1959.

— — — : The Indus Civilization, 3rd ed., Cambridge, 1968.

Williams, M.M. : A Sanskrit English Dictionary, Oxford, 1899. Reprint, Delhi, 1964.

Winternitz, M. : History of Indian Literature, Vol. I-III, Calcutta and Delhi, 1927, 1933 and 1963, 1967.

JOURNALS

Annals of Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.

Annals of Oriental Research, Madras.

Ancient India, Delhi.

Annual Report of the Rajputana Museum, Ajmer.

Annual Report of the Sardar Museum, Jodhpur.

Archaeological Survey of India :

—Archaeological Survey of India Reports, Calcutta.

—Annual Report, Calcutta.

—Annual Report of the Director General of Archaeology, Calcutta.

—Annual (Consolidated) Report of the Archaeological Survey of India, Calcutta.

—Annual Progress Report of Archaeological Survey of India —Western Circle, Bombay.

—Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India, Delhi.

Asiatic Society of Bengal :
—Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of B
—The Journal of the Asiatic Society of I
—Journal and Proceedings of the Asiatic S
New Series.
—Journal of the Asiatic Society of Be
Fourth Series (Title of Journal an
vary : Current title, Journal of Asi
cutta.)
—Proceedings and Transactions of the Ro
of Bengal, Calcutta.
Bhāratīya Vidyā, Bombay.
Bombay Gazetteer, Bombay.
Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African
Bulletin of the Ancient Indian History and Ar
University, Sagar.
East and West, Rome.
Epigraphia Indica, Calcutta, Delhi, Oatacam
Indian Antiquary, Bombay.
Indian Archaeology—A Review, New Delhi.
Indian Culture, Calcutta.
Indian Historical Quarterly, Calcutta.
Indian Numismatic Chronocle, Patna.
Itihāsa Samīkshā, Jaipur.
Journal asiatique, Paris.
Journal of the Assam Research Society, Gau
Journal of the Andhra Historical Research
mundry.
Journal of Ancient Indian History, Calcutta.
Journal of Bihar Research Society, Patna,
Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Soc
Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal
Bombay.
Journal of the Department of Letters, Cal
Journal of the Ganga Nath Jha Research Inst
Journal of Indian History, Trivandrum.
Journal of the Numismatic Society of India,
different places, presently, Varanasi.